

The Fate of the Family

Arthur E. Holt



Class HQ 734

Book H 7927

Copyright N^o COPY 2

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

THE FATE OF THE FAMILY

THE FATE OF THE FAMILY IN THE MODERN WORLD

BY
ARTHUR E. HOLT

*Professor of Social Ethics,
Chicago Theological Seminary*



WILLETT, CLARK & COMPANY

CHICAGO

NEW YORK

1936

Copy 2

HQ 734
H7927
copy 2

Copyright 1936 by
WILLETT, CLARK & COMPANY

Manufactured in The U. S. A. by The Plimpton Press
Norwood, Mass.-LaPorte, Ind.



APR 11 1938
©CIA 115818

cr

TO MY FAMILY

H.W. 5/12/38

FOREWORD

THESE CHAPTERS were originally presented as part of the radio extension program of the University of Chicago. The consequent appreciation shown by husbands and wives and fathers and mothers encouraged the belief that they were perhaps helpful enough to justify their commitment to print. The fact that they were given as lectures accounts for much that is informal and colloquial in their present style.

I wish to acknowledge a debt of obligation to both the Reverend Anton T. Boisen, lecturer and research associate in the psychology of religion at the Chicago Theological Seminary, and to Mrs. Anna May Hornsby for valuable suggestions and the use of case work material.

CONTENTS

CHRISTIANITY AND FAMILY LIFE	I
------------------------------	---

PART ONE

TYPES OF FAMILIES

I. ORIENTAL MARRIAGE: THE TOTALITARIAN RACE	9
II. CONVENTIONAL EUROPEAN MARRIAGE: THE TOTALITARIAN CLASS	20
III. DEMOCRACY AND THE ROMANTIC MARRIAGE	28

PART TWO

THE MENACE OF INDIVIDUALISM

IV. THE BETRAYAL OF THE FAMILY	43
V. THE SELF-CENTERED MIND	50
VI. URBAN AND RURAL ATOMISM	62
VII. THE SURRENDER OF ROMANCE	71

PART THREE

IMPROVING THE DEMOCRATIC FAMILY

VIII. THE PROBLEM FACING THE ROMANTIC MARRIAGE	81
--	----

IX. INSIDE THE FAMILY CIRCLE	86
X. SOCIALIZING THE FAMILY	93
XI. MAKING THE NATION SAFE FOR THE FAMILY	110
XII. WHEN THE FAMILY MUST FIGHT FOR ITS RIGHTS	121

PART FOUR

THE CHURCH AND THE FAMILY

XIII. WHEN PEOPLE MEET CRISES	131
XIV. SOCIETIES OF INTERPRETATION	137
XV. RELIGION AS A RESOURCE FOR MENTAL HEALTH	148
XVI. WHEN RELIGIONS BEHAVE BADLY	155
XVII. WHEN RELIGIONS BEHAVE WELL	165
XVIII. WHOM HATH GOD JOINED?	177
XIX. SUMMARY	182

THE FATE OF THE FAMILY

CHRISTIANITY AND FAMILY LIFE

MOST OF US have at some time attended a wedding at a church when two young people, before an assembly of friends and relatives, came down the aisle with their attendants and plighted their troth as the minister read to them the great ritual of the church. We have heard him use the words:

Dearly beloved brethren, we are gathered together here in the sight of God and in the face of this company to join together this man and this woman in holy matrimony.

We have heard him ask the question:

John, wilt thou have this woman to thy wedded wife to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony?

And:

Mary, wilt thou have this man to thy wedded husband to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony?

And at the end he has pronounced those ominous words:

Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder.

The solemnity of the great ritual, the music, the congratulations of friends, the exalted joy, have made the whole occasion significant in our eyes. Sometimes we have even thought that the greatest service which the church renders in the community lies in making impressive and giving meaning to this great occasion.

We have seen these two young people, with the good will of interested friends, establish their home in the community. To that home the minister has gone in what we have termed "pastoral calling." These two people have attended church. Later we have seen them come down the aisle with their first born and pledge themselves to rear the child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. We have seen the child join some of the numerous groups which are always present in the well-organized church.

In earlier days there was the family pew — still used in some churches — where families regularly took their places and joined in divine worship. The youth who departed from these families found natural association in the church fellowships, and they in turn were married, and another cycle began. One by one, as the threescore years and ten were completed, those who sat in the family pews were borne away to the quiet spot on the hill where the larger fellowship of the saints will always be. In the mind of the church they joined the Church Eternal.

All of us, as we meditated on the cycle, have felt that there is an intimate relationship between the institution we call the church and the institution we call

the family. This relationship is not peculiar to any one faith. In all its essentials it is true of Judaism, Catholicism and Protestantism. There seems to be something universal in the relationship.

Yet, although we have been impressed by the intimate relationships between church and family and have hoped that the bonds so sacredly sealed would be permanent, we have often seen the families which "God hath joined together" torn asunder and devastated by great social scourges such as intemperance, prostitution, gambling and ignorance. Against these the church has often taken up arms. It has fought them because they have proved to be enemies of that which the church regards as sacred and worthy of preservation. Much of the so-called invasion of the social order on which the church has ventured in the past has been in the interest of the family.

We are now discovering, too, that these families which we hoped would be permanent are caught up on the waves of economic and social change which sweep through communities and again rend asunder the religious bonds. We have accused people of being false to their religious vows; but gradually we are seeing that family life is intimately related to the whole economic and social structure, and that it is impossible to solve the problems of the family by resting our confidence on religious formulas. It is therefore worth while for us seriously to study the implications involved in this close relationship between religion, the family and society. There may be meanings in it which we

have not yet probed, complications we have not sensed there may be a significance which is profound and of concern to all. Here are some of the questions with which we must deal:

We propose, first of all, to discuss the nature of the family and of marriage in countries of the Orient. Families in the United States are different from those in the East and in Europe. We shall try to discover the genius of all families and then the genius peculiar to the American family. Another important question is: What is to be the fate of the American democratic system of marriage in both the capitalistic and socialistic state?

Then there are certain types of problems which are indigenous to family life; there are relationships between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, and these we must consider. The family is but one of a fellowship of organizations to which people give their allegiance; what shall be the proper relationship between the family, the neighborhood, the business and political organizations, and how can the members of the family successfully share their loyalty with other institutions? We shall also ask: What is the peculiar contribution which religion and the church make to family life? Does the church have a function like that of the social worker, or one peculiarly its own? We may decide that the function of the church is to deepen the sense of meaning in the family function. In that event we must ask how the church should go about it. What are the practical ways in which the

church makes family life significant? Since not all religious behavior is good, when do religions behave badly and when do they behave well?

These questions are of great practical importance at the present time. New social orders are rising which are seeking to impose the genius of the state upon the genius of the family. Many of the activities of the family are being invaded by the state. It is not yet clear what the fate of the family will be in the totalitarian state which is now asserting itself. Those who would keep the family free must nevertheless recognize that our democratic society has left us with an atomistic theory of the family which has often robbed that institution of its resources for romance and left it unrelated to the other functions with which it should be joined in a great fellowship.

Finally, what do we mean by the phrase, "Whom God hath joined together"?

In all types of marriage, with the exception of the romantic, family life exists for something larger than itself. In the Oriental marriage it exists for the continuity and glory of the ancestral group; in the conventional marriage it exists for the glory of the class; in some European countries it exists for the glory of the state. In Christianity, however, the family exists for God, interpreted by the church. Can the Christian religion offer to the family that larger than self which is worthy of supreme devotion?

PART ONE

TYPES OF FAMILIES

I

ORIENTAL MARRIAGE: THE TOTALITARIAN RACE

ONLY IN comparatively recent times has the family, made up of father and mother and children, been a free unit in society. The Oriental system works for the freedom of the race but not for the freedom of the family. Millions of people in India and China live under a system which might be called a "totalitarian racial economy." More important than the state or the family unit is the ancestral racial economy.

Some years ago, while traveling in the backwaters of the rivers which flow into the ocean in south India, I saw a young lad come out of the forest followed by a beautiful young girl. The two took their seats in a boat and rowed off out of sight down the river. My companion, a native of Travancore, remarked to me: "There goes a young lad home with his bride. Probably he never saw her until this morning and he is taking her to his father's home." I remarked to my friend, "Did the young man have a chance to choose his bride?" "No," he said, "his parents did that for him. He has had very little to say about it, and she has had nothing to say about it." My Indian friend was acquainted with Western ways and, sensing my

unexpressed doubt about a system which allows for no preliminary love-making in marriage, he remarked: "You Westerners fall in love and marry afterward. Here people marry and fall in love afterward. And," he added, "there is much to be said for our system."

While I was living in Calcutta I watched across the street from my place of residence a wedding ceremony which lasted over the better part of a week. There were processions with bands, riders mounted on camels, elephants and horses, gold- and silver-plated automobiles, banquets, and formal and informal visits. The bride was six years old and the groom was eight. They looked like toy people as they sat in a marvelously decorated car and rode away in the wedding procession. The affair was really a state occasion between two families. The bridegroom had had nothing to say about the planning of it. The families were hurrying it through before the passage of the Saarda Act which made such early marriages illegal in India. These children were going to join a larger family made up of grandfathers, grandmothers, aunts, uncles, cousins. They would know nothing of the responsibilities which two young people in the West take upon themselves when they establish a new home. They were not called upon to be self-supporting. Practically all the important questions in the procedure and in their later life would be settled by the elders. "Theirs not to reason why. . . ."

It is difficult for those who are accustomed to the romantic and individualistic ideas of the West to find such a system anything but objectionable. The defense

of it I wish to offer is in the words of that most notable Indian poet, philosopher and prose writer, Rabindranath Tagore, found in Count Keyserling's *Book of Marriage* (Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1926):

. . . The way to marriage which is shown by the torchlight of passion has not for its goal the welfare of society, but the satisfaction of desire. Even in Europe, where the obligation of the individual to society is much lighter than in India, it is well known how the mingling of the sexes under the impulse of passion often gives rise to antisocial difficulties; but there, society being mobile, the effects are not so deep as with us. In the *shastras*, therefore, the *Brahma* marriage is considered to be the best. According to this, the bride should be given to the man who had not solicited her. If the institution of marriage has to be regulated strictly from the social standpoint, room cannot be found for the personal wishes of the people concerned; so the system which obtains in the case of the royal houses of Europe is also the system which prevails throughout Hindu society. . . . (p. 108)

In societies where the household is founded on the comfort and convenience of the individual, his acceptance or nonacceptance of the householder's estate remains optional. If any such should say that he does not care for domestic joys, but prefers the freedom of irresponsibility, no room for objection is left. But in Hindu India, because a house-

hold is an essential element in its social structure, marriage is almost compulsory — like conscription in Europe on the threat of war.

According to our Lawgivers, anyone making gifts to, or taking gifts from, a Brahmin who remains a householder, but does not marry, goes to hell. Says Atri: "No hospitality should be accepted from an unmarried householder." The household has been compared in our *shastras* to a great tree, for, just as the roots of the latter support its branches, twigs, and foliage, so does the life of the household maintain the different institutions of society; and the Lawgiver lays it down that the king should do honor to the upholder of the householder's estate. . . . (pp. 101-2)

. . . It will then become clear that, in this type of society, having for its object the perfection of communal life, there is danger in allowing marriage to pursue the path of self-will. Such a society can withstand the encroachments of Nature only if its marriage system is walled around with a protective embankment. So the Hindu ideal of marriage has no regard for individual taste or inclination — it is, rather, afraid of them.

If any European would really understand the psychology behind this, let him bethink himself of the state of things that obtained during the last war. Ordinarily, in Europe, there is no bar to international marriages. But when the one objective of war overshadowed all other considerations, mar-

riage with a subject of an enemy country became an impossibility; so much so, that European society felt no compunction in cruelly severing even long-standing marriage ties of this description. Not only was the marriage question affected, but during war conditions food and all other amenities of life had to be cut down to a uniform standard. The personal liberty and elasticity of occupation, so characteristic of Western civilization, tended wholly to disappear.

These war conditions afford a good parallel to the permanent conditions which govern Hindu society, where the encroachment of alien cultures has always been a constant danger to be guarded against. This vital objective of the twice-born leaders who practically represented the whole people, therefore, runs as a steady undercurrent throughout our society. The problem of keeping its civilization pure having been acknowledged as all-important, and its solution thus sought by India, her society has had to claim for its members the severe and permanent curbing of their individual liberty of choice and action. . . . (pp. 104-5)

Another way for the better understanding by the European of the mentality underlying our marriage system would be by reference to the discussions on eugenics which are a feature of modern Europe. The science of eugenics, like all other sciences, attaches little weight to personal sentiment. According to it, selection by personal in-

clination must be rigorously regulated for the sake of the progeny. If the principle involved be once admitted, marriage needs must be rescued from the control of the heart and brought under the province of the intellect. Otherwise, insoluble problems will keep on arising for passion reckes not of consequences, nor brooks interference by outside judges. . . . (p. 108)

Here the question arises: If desire be banished from the very threshold of marriage, how can love find any place in wedded life? Those who have no true acquaintance with our country, and whose marriage system is entirely different, take it for granted that Hindu marriage is loveless. But do we not know of our own knowledge how false is such a conclusion? (p. 111)

This brings to my mind the conversation I once had with an agriculturist. I was complaining to him of the lack of common grazing grounds in our villages, whereupon he told me that it was a mistake to suppose that a cow would thrive best if allowed to graze at will. Scientific feeding with especially cultivated fodder crops only could yield the best results. These must have been the lines of argument, in regard to married love, pursued in our country. For the purpose of marriage spontaneous love is unreliable; its proper cultivation should yield the best results — such was the conclusion — and this cultivation should begin before marriage. Therefore, from their earliest years, the

husband as an idea is held up before our girls in verse and story, through ceremonial and worship. When at length they get this husband he is to them not a person but a principle, like loyalty, patriotism, or such other abstractions which owe their immense strength to the fact that the best part of them is our own creation and therefore part of our inner being. . . . (pp. 112-13)

Tagore mentions two weaknesses in the Hindu system. The first is that it is so closely knit that the least loosening of the fiber in any of its parts tends to disruption. It is afraid of the contact of the outside world because the bond which holds it together is that of external regulation whose strength depends upon habitual conformity. The other objection is that the special qualities of head and heart which once found varied support in a broad Indian social system are now dying for lack of exercise.

The Indian system is almost identical with that of China. Here again we have the larger family taking control of the affairs of the married couple. From the imperial palace down to the lowest coolie's house every family must have a shrine with wooden tablet bearing in writing the names of sacred ancestors. The controlling principle of the family is reverence for these ancestors, and the object of the family is to carry on that sacred stream of humanity which flows through the ancestors. To them a sacrificial ceremony, however simple, is performed at least three times a year. The

book of rites says the object of all ceremonies is to bring down the spirits from above. In funeral rites the calling back of the soul of the deceased plays an important part. Sacrifices of food and clothing, designed to make the spirit happy, have in later years replaced the earlier elaborate offerings which included often sacrifice of human life. In ancestor worship, then, will be found the reason of the Chinese family's existence. The purpose of marriage is the procreation of sons to carry on the family line.

The Chinese family is patriarchal, which means that the father rules and kinship is through him. Woman, on marriage, leaves her family to become a part of her husband's family. The oldest male of the family assumes authority. On the death of the father the oldest son becomes head. At one time the power of life and death was vested in the father. Inside the house, the wife of the oldest male of the oldest generation is head. She manages the home and the daughters-in-law and supervises the work and home industry.

Five social virtues are emphasized in the family: filial piety, reverence for elders, faith between husband and wife, loyalty to the sovereign, and sincerity among friends. For every individual his ancestors are links in the chain which joins the Chinese to eternity.

Instead of free courtship between young men and women such as we know in the romantic marriage, arrangements in China are taken in hand by the parents or by a middleman with the parents' consent. The agreement of the parents is as binding as is the marriage

itself. Horoscopes are often read to find the right mate, to determine whether or not the couple will harmonize or supplement one another. A dowry paid by the man's parents to the girl's parents is supposed to cover what has been spent on the girl from her birth to her wedding — since she now ceases to be a part of her family and becomes a part of her husband's family.

The marriage ceremony is somewhat as follows: The groom sends a red chair with a member of his family, an uncle or someone who has many sons, to the home of the bride; the bride returns in the red chair and crosses the threshold of her husband's home. Bowing to the family spirits and to the mother and father of the groom, the bride acknowledges allegiance to them. Eating wedding cakes together and drinking together from the same cup of wine, the bride and groom acknowledge their allegiance to each other. The bride is welcomed into the family by an aunt, or some woman of the husband's family who is a mother of sons. Now that she has become a member of the family she owes her loyalty to it.

Children are taught manners, customs and household duties within the family. Boys are taught to worship ancestors and household gods and the girls are prepared for marriage. The children are greatly loved and revered.

The method of divorce is to return the wife to her first home and, often, to publish a notice of divorce in a newspaper.

On almost the entire Asiatic continent this marriage

system is prevalent. India's 350,000,000 and China's 450,000,000 all maintain it. The system is basic to Asiatic life and therefore takes precedence over the whims or decisions of brides and grooms.

If one has traveled in the Orient, one notices that the larger family of the Orient has developed its own type of household architecture. The different sub-units in a larger family have their separate households, but all the houses, instead of facing on the street or out into public life as they do in the West, face toward a private court which is the center of this larger family unit. This situation has a very real effect on what might be called the public-mindedness of the family. The family thinks first of the larger family, and the larger family has a tendency to think in terms of itself — a fact which gives rise to nepotism, or the tendency on the part of its members to look after the family's interests. Those who have had something to do with administration in the Orient have found themselves wrestling with the problem of how to keep a prominent Chinese or a prominent Indian from giving all the jobs at his disposal to members of his family without regard to their fitness for public service. Of course, nepotism is not confined to the Orient, but there it exemplifies the way in which family life is more self-centered than public-minded.

Perhaps it is not fair to call this the nonromantic type of marriage, because romance is organized around the ancestors, around the family gods, around the family welfare. And this type of romance, of course, has a

very great attraction for the individual member of the Chinese or Indian family. But as romance does not center in the feeling of the bride for the groom or the groom for the bride, on the whole it seems proper to call this the nonromantic type of marriage as distinguished from the Western type.

II

CONVENTIONAL EUROPEAN MARRIAGE: THE TOTALITARIAN CLASS

I TURN NOW to another great continent where the classes — of which three are recognized: peasantry, nobility and royalty — constitute areas which set a limit and determine the bounds within which marriage can take place. The people of those three major classes marry not primarily for personal satisfaction but for the good of the class, for the glory of that for which the class stands. If the class has for its object the creation of a larger nation, then in a very real sense its members marry for the glory of the nation. This we at a distance have often recognized as being true of royalty. We have not realized that it is true also of peasantry and nobility.

As clear a statement of the case for the European marriage of convenience as I know — and one that as we look back seems almost prophetic — is that contributed by Paul Thun to Keyserling's *Book of Marriage*. Mr. Thun was looking for the "rejuvenation of Europe." "A prime factor in this rejuvenation," he insisted, "will be the coming back in all of its power of the marriage of convention." He said:

We are entering a new heroic age. Sentiment will die a natural death. Liberalism [of course by that he means democracy] will become extinct on account of its weakness of character. Only courage has a future. The constructive element must win.
(p. 154)

This presupposes that marriage as the germ cell of history shall rest anew on the austere but beautiful ethos which is the characteristic of historical conventional marriage. The rebirth of this conception will lead to the rebirth of the nobility. He continued:

. . . There is no other marriage worthy of the name than the conventional, in the sense of cultural marriage . . . it is only this form of matrimony which can lead mankind to the higher significance of things. . . .

What is the conventional marriage? In place of the marriage wherein the bride and groom center their romance in each other and have a large range of choice there is substituted the marriage whose purpose is the serving of one's class, be it peasantry, nobility or royalty. Mr. Thun said:

. . . Marriage has its roots lodged in the earth and is most intimately associated with nature. It is built up on the innate nature of the darkest of all human passions, and in its operation it should never deny this natural quality. Thus marriage

represents a definite status for its origin is not due to any social order, no matter how primitive or vitally permanent, but it is a part of the cosmic order, the destiny of mankind. . . . Peasants, nobles and kings constitute real classes. . . . To be a peasant, noble or a king is an organic vocation.

When it [marriage] fulfills this meaning, when it keeps the objective always in sight, in the spirit as well as in the letter, then only does the blood and tissue of its race remain vital. The body which is inspired by a spiritual purpose cannot degenerate. . . . Here, in my opinion, is the secret of the preservation of races of hoary antiquity in the character of peasantry, nobility and royalty. These have not avoided inbreeding which tends to cause degeneration, but on the contrary, often seemed to foster it; yet they continue to exist, because their life is significant, whereas all other male lines usually perish within three generations. Where the spirit of a conscious order or class is not bent on the life of the day for its maintenance but on a distant future, the natural qualities that are particular to a real class receive a special significance that amounts almost to a mystical charm. (p. 142)

Mr. Thun went on to say that the devotion of a European noble to his class is not unlike the consecration of the religious soul who contemplates the divinity of Christ. He acquires a mystical ecstasy in reflecting upon the purely human growth and earthly existence

of the Savior, just as the motherhood of the Virgin Mary urges us to express anew that most delicate of all secrets. Mr. Thun stated that in the higher orders, or classes, which depend entirely on their ethos, the naturally human attributes have, from the very beginning, been surrounded by an intrinsic charm which converts the most natural manifestation into something unique and wonderful. Evidently Mr. Thun was here referring to romance. But in place of the romance which the bride and groom or which lovers organize around one another, he was talking about the romance of the class — the romance of feeling that one is a member of the nobility, the romance of serving the state. “This,” he said, “is a substitute for their romantic love for each other.”

It is at least an interesting thought that there are kinds of romance which can organize around marriage other than the romantic love of the bride and groom for each other. “Only marriages,” said Mr. Thun, “which comply with the conscious conception of class preserve the ethos of a whole race and consequently its vitality.” He attempted to give an illustration in the Jewish race:

In spite of the annihilating tendency of the Diaspora, the Jews all over the world have maintained their vitality because their powerful ethos was never allowed to become quiescent or enfeebled, but kept alive an ardent aspiration which was transmitted from one generation to another by means of con-

scious marriage ideals. How widespread the inbreeding and how slight the degeneracy! (pp. 145-6)

In other words, there is among the Jews a race morale which, communicating itself to the individual family, lifts it above the disorganization which would be characteristic of this family if it were dependent only upon its own resources. There seems to be here an additional element of romance which reinforces the individual romantic resources of the family. Our author explained that, in similar fashion, the nobility of Europe, through the centuries, have had as a guiding principle for their lives and an unquenchable source of strength the thought that the conventional marriage was directed toward the welfare of the people, that it was secure from self-centeredness and prevented from becoming overschematized. There has been something which has lifted the conventional marriage far above the resources which are found only in the romantic feeling of two people for each other. Mr. Thun said:

Taking into consideration the wonderful results of the conscious application of "conventional marriage," are the restrictions regarding choice of partners, the attaching of less importance to sensual love — in a word, the renunciation which is an integral part of it — anything but a joyous and splendid sacrifice? It is a renunciation that is veritably born of an ardent affirmation of life and its significance.

It is due to human nature in its deepest sense that one finds in the highest circles of life the most striking examples of premeditated "conventional marriage," *real* marriage, the sharing of mutual destiny. Powerful above joy and sorrow, yes, overwhelming in its strength, is the ethos of woman. . . . Those who, according to their rank, live on the heights, if they really comply with the conditions laid down by their station in life, and do not conform merely outwardly thereto, are living super-personally. Even the impoverished nobleman lives super-personally, for pride of family and station give him a yearning beyond his own forgotten existence. And so does the peasant for he assumes responsibility for the holy heritage of the homestead and in his turn hands it on. In all these forms of life, women take an intimate and essential part. Because here it is a question of cosmic classification, which is inherent in the economy of the universe, marriage essentially means to her participation in the life ethos of man. . . . In my opinion no other form of association deserves the title of marriage at all, for it cannot convey the wonderful meaning contained in the word "marriage." For other forms, a monstrous word coined by a sociologist is apt: *Hausrat-Gemeinschaft* — community of household goods. (p. 148)

Thus ended his defense of the nonromantic conventional marriage. Such a conception undoubtedly

shocks and surprises one acquainted only with our romantic type of American marriage where almost unlimited responsibility is thrust upon the bride and groom. One essential feature of it, however, should not escape our attention. There *is* romance in this picture. It is romance for something that is beyond marriage and is shared by both parties to the marriage. The romance, as portrayed by Mr. Thun, centers first of all around the consciousness of carrying on the great cosmic purpose of procreation, a purpose expressed not in the individual family but in the class of which this individual family is a part.

A second element is renunciation for the sake of the glory of one's class. A great collective life stream represented by a family, tracing its history back for a thousand years, rooted on some great estate for generations, glorified by all the symbols and ceremonies with which it is possible to glorify a class — this becomes an object worthy of loyalty. To sacrifice for this is no hardship; it is a joy. It is this something larger than marriage, this something that gives a sense of meaning to life and somewhat lessens the emphasis on personal likes and dislikes of the bride and groom that, I think, is significant in all types of conventional marriage. Perhaps it is this something which we need to add to our Western idea of romantic marriage in order to give a clearer meaning to it. Through our emphasis on one type of romance in marriage we may have sacrificed those other sources of romance preserved in what has been called the nonromantic type. In any case, as we turn now

to a study of what is commonly called "romantic" marriage let us keep in mind the fact that a very large number of the families of the world carry on with a romance of their own, which, though different, is just as real as that which we emphasize in the West.

III

DEMOCRACY AND THE ROMANTIC MARRIAGE

THE ROMANTIC or democratic marriage is the expression in terms of sex life of the democratic movement. First of all, let us get a picture of the democratic movement in its larger aspects in order that we may better understand this vital part of it. The rise of democracy was the consequence of a revolt against feudalism and the control exercised over society by the church and the feudal lords of the Middle Ages. Feudalism was patriarchal. Society was organized as a caste system. There were three orders: the kings, the nobility and clergy, and the peasantry. The marriage of convention was a part of feudalism.

Democracy came with the revolt of the middle classes and was built essentially around the rise of the trader. Up to this time, trading, moneylending and manufacturing had been carried on under the feudal lords on great manors which were simple but complete social units. Society was organized from the top down. It was paternalistic and autocratic.

Our greatest student of medieval society, James Westfall Thomson, said in his *Economic and Social History*

of the Middle Ages (Century Co., 1928), that the most significant revolution in Western society was not the industrial revolution, but the emergence to power in the thirteenth century of the trader, the manufacturer and the moneylender. These men were the leaders in the new towns which under them became self-conscious, fought with the feudal leaders and wrested power from them. For a time they sought in the great Hanseatic League to set up a town economy which would supplant the nation. The rising nationalism fought them back.

Though the national idea seemed to triumph the men of the towns developed a new game. They let the nations control the army and they controlled the nations. From the fourteenth century the merchant traders of western Europe sailed the seven seas with armies furnished by their respective nations. They set up their sea-trader citadels on the shores of all the great continents. Through military power they controlled great agricultural dependencies for the purpose of profitable trade. These men from the cities of western Europe had a feeling for navigation. They knew the significance of tariffs, customs and currency rates. John Calvin taught them that it was right to take interest and to trade for profit. They were more pious than ethical. John Hawkins, carrying slaves from Sierra Leone to Spain in a ship called the "Jesus of Lubeck," counseled his crew "to serve God daily, love one another, preserve your victuals, beware of fire and seek good company."

These merchant seamen founded such centers of trade as Boston, New York and Philadelphia. Here for one hundred and fifty years their sons carried on with the help of yeomen, and then, because they needed navigation laws, tariff and currency rates, they staged a revolution against the sea traders of the home country. The issues in this revolution, according to the historian, Charles A. Beard, were: (1) navigation acts; (2) laws restricting freedom of trade; (3) restriction of colonial manufacture; (4) currency rates favorable to the creditor class; and (5) taxation without representation — all causes dear to the trader heart.

The trader class has written the tariff laws of this country and has created a situation in which the bargaining power of the manufacturer is almost double that of the farmer with whom he bargains. It has also written most of the tax laws of the country and has succeeded in loading an undue burden on the common man. Favored as this class has been, it has voted itself unbelievably large incomes for doing the things which traders do; incomes which make the kings of the feudal ages look like poverty-stricken beggars; incomes which are out of all proportion to any possible return which they can render to society. They have taken for themselves two-thirds of the price of every food product which is on its way from the farmer to the masses of the city. As a result, there has been an overamplification of what men do in cities. The size and opulence of the city is out of all proportion to the usefulness of what it does. The last one hundred years have seen the un-

precedented growth of the city as the outstanding social phenomenon of a trader-controlled world.

Even more important than the growth of the cities have been the standards of living and ethical goals of society set by this trader class. In *The Epic of America*, James Truslow Adams, who was once a businessman, has told us the story of the moral debacle which took place in the middle of the last century when money-making as an end in itself displaced the dream of the welfare of the common man as the goal of American society:

Money-making having become a virtue, it was no longer controlled by the virtues but ranked with them and could be weighed against them where any conflict occurred. The quick development of an industry or a tract of land and the making of a million dollars to be added to the capital resources of the nation could be weighed as exhibitions of moral and patriotic virtue against breaches of other exhibitions of virtue such as justice or honesty. Raising money-making to the rank of a patriotic and moral virtue was the cancer that ate deep into the vitals of our life. It meant the demoralization of our whole attitude toward law and public life. (p. 191)

It would be foolish to underestimate the social advantages of the rule of the trader class. Along with this rule has come the growth of science with the subsequent uniting of the world, if not in brotherhood, at

least in neighborhood, through the marvelous victory over time and space accomplished by the steamship, railroad, airplane, telegraph and radio. It has been the mission of the trader class to tie the world together in a great system of interrelated trade.

Out of the struggle of the trader against feudalism came certain great slogans which express a social philosophy — democracy — largely organized around the rights of the individual. These slogans include the demand for free speech, free press, private initiative in business, emphasis on the sacredness of private property, the right of private judgment, of self-determination, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is not unfair, I think, to say that democracy as a working philosophy is an emphasis on rights. It is the philosophy by which the peoples of the world have declared themselves free from what they consider to be overarching tyrannies; kings have suffered ill at the hands of democracy. This philosophy has paralleled the Western career of capitalism and is essentially what we mean by rugged individualism.

Along with this movement in business and politics has come a similar movement in the organization of the family. Many people believe that it is a delayed movement so far as the family is concerned; that because of the intimate, tender relationships in family life, there has been a tendency to maintain in the family longer than anywhere else the ideas of the feudal authoritarian economy. The pace has been slower, perhaps, but nevertheless the home has shared in the democratic movement.

Let us compare the democratic marriage with the marriage of convention. In the first place, the democratic marriage has its roots in the free association of boys and girls in a coeducational public school system or in some other association where there are abundant opportunities for comradeship and courtship. Most of us cannot remember the time when we did not make dates with the other sex. Moreover, this courtship is highly competitive. Love-making is always competitive everywhere, but the American variety is the most highly competitive in the world. It is courting not only by men, but also by women. Courting is made more competitive by accessories of wealth — luxury, high-powered automobiles, ease and quickness of transportation. Hardly more than a generation ago the number of girls a man could court was determined by the distance he could drive the old family horse and top buggy; today he can court all the girls in the range of a high-powered automobile. The courtings are followed by democratic choices.

The marriage service is now modified so that the bride seldom promises to obey, or if she does it is with distinct reservations. The subject is generally recognized as one to be settled later. The young people go to live in a house or apartment of their own which fronts, not like the house in the Oriental compound on a privately determined court, but on the street. In a modern apartment it is a distinct understanding that nothing stands between this particular family and their own self-determined loyalties outside.

These two young people are expected to spend a

great deal of their time alone. No larger family adds its resources of sociability. In the Orient, the young couple joins a family within which there is already a rich social life. There will be brothers with their wives and children, aunts, uncles, grandfathers — forming a distinct little community. No such community exists (probably wisely, perhaps nobody desires it) for the democratic family of the West. The dowry in American life is unusual. No larger family shares the burden of financial support. No other families are started with as large a burden of self-support thrown upon a bride and groom as our American romantic family. Sometimes it is this very burden which causes the romance to fade as the days go by.

The Western married couple live in a highly competitive life, especially in a highly competitive financial world. They must make for themselves major decisions in finance and in household management. They are subject to free associations with people outside the marriage group. If the bride goes to work she is in an office where there are many men; if the husband is working he is in an office where there are many women — and no purdah system puts blinders on the roving eye in Western society. Moreover, women by legal right now inherit half of the joint property. If a woman chooses to be a “gold digger,” she can in many cases become independent. In any kind of separation, either by death or divorce, by the law itself she becomes possessor of half of the family inheritance or half of the family financial ability.

The factory has taken most of the economic burden from the home. The husband must make money enough to buy what the factory will sell. It is not often realized that one reason why the modern man is so confined to his business is that he now has to provide funds with which to buy that which his grandmother made at home. Modern opportunity for industrial work for women frees them from the economic necessity of marriage and at the same time multiplies competition for the man. The school stands ready to take care of the children almost from the nursery until they march out of the university with a Ph.D. degree. The necessity of bearing children at all has been obviated by modern methods of contraception.

This is, in general, the picture of the democratic family. It varies, of course, as between country and city. In the country families still carry on a large part of the activities of the farm.

Many of those who feel that the democratic principle has arrived late in family life are desirous of extending it. They feel that the burden of tradition, of authority, of mystery and custom, still lies heavily on the democratic family, and that if the family is to advance as far in its revolt against authoritarianism as has business and politics, there is still a long road for it to travel. But those who would carry the democratic principle to its limit fail to meet the question answered by the other two types of marriage we have studied. They do not, in terms of something larger than itself, tell us for what purpose democratic marriage exists.

They make the likes and dislikes of two individuals an end in themselves. What, in the romantic marriage, offers substitutes for those resources of morale which are found to be so real in the Oriental marriage and the marriage of convention? The case for and against the romantic marriage can be stated as below.

A rough classification of the functions and their corresponding institutions in society would look somewhat as follows:

Religion	Sex	Education	Economics	Government
Church	Family	School	Business	State

Under feudalism these functions and institutions were bound together in something of an organic whole under the church. In the Orient they were organized under the family.

The movement of society in the East and West has been in the direction of freeing the genius of each of these institutions from the tyranny of the others. Inside these institutions there has been the tendency to free each part from the control of any other part. This, however, was never the whole of the democratic movement. It was always assumed that the parts which had been freed would come together in some kind of a new social arrangement. The democratic movement never intended a fragmented society. The freeing of the parts from mutual tyranny was in the interest of a new associated fellowship. The fact remains, however, that democracy has, in too many cases, stopped far short

of fulfillment. It is from this angle that we wish to view the very real merits, and the equally real faults, of the romantic marriage.

First, the Western marriage has made great progress in freeing the genius of the family from the other functions of society; it has made equal progress in freeing the members of the family from one another. On the other hand, it has laid very little emphasis on the terms on which these free institutions and these free individuals are to form a new organic association. In a word, the romantic marriage has stopped half way in its march toward its goal.

Second, the romantic marriage is built on a foundation of affection and love. Its ideal of unselfish devotion endows it with the highest moral quality. A system which evokes such a highly social idea to a great extent justifies its existence.

Third, the democratic marriage satisfies the worthwhile elements of individualism as a legitimate extension of the principle of voluntary choice which is a characteristic of civilization as over against primitive barbarism. There was a time when wives were stolen; now they are courted. There was a time when men seized the reins of power by force; now they must be elected. There was a time when the strong took the food they wanted; now they must buy it. The romantic marriage is an extension of the philosophy of consent which is one of the characteristics of a free society, and it belongs through spirit and form in that constellation of activities to which we give the collec-

tive name, democracy. This is the point at which the Oriental marriages have failed and it is also the point from which to criticize the new totalitarian societies.

Finally, the romantic marriage insures against caste; when the right of choice is not limited by traditional lines no caste system can with any success fasten itself upon society. It has all the advantages of free competition in any line.

There is small likelihood that, having tasted the joys of courtship, young people will turn the prerogative of selection back to their parents — a prerogative inextricably bound up with all other rights in a society in which men and women claim the right to make choices. The romantic marriage is the emotional core of all our social life and for this reason it becomes the central function in the whole democratic movement. There is in it something more powerful than economic determinism. We are more likely to determine our property relationships on the basis of the way we organize our families than we are to organize our families on the basis of property laws — a fact which the proponents of economic determinism might seriously consider.

The principal weakness, however, of the romantic marriage lies in its failure to recognize that all life must be individual *and* collective. Feudalism was organic. Religion, economics, marriage and politics, all were part of an organic whole. The romantic marriage is an isolated unit in an atomistic society. Its defenders fail to recognize that the pleasure of freedom of choice is transitory unless it is reinforced by auxiliary joys

drawn from the great social will to live from which we come and for which we must carry on. The free individual is not an end in himself.

The romantic marriage has a sound basis. It is the free act of two individuals of reasonable maturity between whom the tides of passion run strong. But romance is soon exhausted unless the family is willing to mobilize new and deeper resources than those affixed to passion. When two young people start on the great adventure they are often not equipped with a social philosophy adequate for that adventure.

The romantic marriage has not accepted its responsibility as the center of a constellation of free social functions, each of which must exist for something more than itself. Those who build families will have to accept this fact. Society cannot endure chaotic relationships in its central function. Those who form families must recognize that they must consciously take over the task of creating for the family function a meaningful place in society, or they will become to a great extent responsible for a totalitarian social order through regimentation by some outside force that will command the unity they fail to give.

PART TWO

THE MENACE OF INDIVIDUALISM

IV

THE BETRAYAL OF THE FAMILY

MARRIAGE IS essentially an experience in associated living. There are times when every individual in the family must guard his rights; but democracy, interpreted as a philosophy of rights, is not all-inclusive enough to take care of the situation. A nation cannot be built out of 120,000,000 little Patrick Henrys, each shouting, "Give me liberty or give me death!" Likewise, a family cannot be formed by individuals who seek only personal liberty. When father, mother, brothers and sisters all seek individual liberty, the family disintegrates. Personalities clash. The home becomes a place of many tensions. The romantic family is being destroyed by those who interpret democracy only in terms of individualism.

Grasping the principle of individualism, many of those who would improve the democratic type of marriage have sought to apply it to the family. They have developed what Beatrice Hinkle, an ardent defender of the romantic marriage, has called "the cult of the ego," based on impatient revolt from the old tradition and law-impelled domination of the husband and father. To some extent they are justified, for it should

be recognized that the family has been an agency for enlarging the ego of the man. In the first place, the woman has had to take the man's name; I do not know of anything which flatters the ego of man more thoroughly than does that. For a long time it was only the man who could own property. The man was considered the head of the family. Those who are trying to improve marriage now say that the period has come when man is no longer to have this monopoly on egoism in family life. The child has a personality which is to be respected; the wife has a personality. All have a right to feel themselves individuals in the family. Judge Ben Lindsey feels that the restrictions of old customs in family life thwart the lives of both the woman and children, and often of the man also. But the efficacy of the individualistic principle as a formula for improving society in other relations is very much in doubt and is being challenged on many sides. In fact, it is now a discarded principle in most of the other phases of Western culture — philosophy, ethics, religion, economics — which have hitherto been operating under it.

Let us take, for example, the philosophers. Not long ago the South African soldier and philosopher, J. C. Smuts, in *Holism and Evolution* (Macmillan Co., 1926), developed the thesis that for the greatest good to the greatest number the whole is more important than the part. He called attention to the fact that for three hundred years we have been magnifying the part; now, society is involved in a great reverse movement in which

the importance of the whole is emphasized over that of the part.

Last autumn, in Lawrence, Kansas, I met an ardent advocate of the *Gestalt* point of view. On the walls of his office was a chart which revealed that until about the fourteenth century society had been moving in the direction of an emphasis on the importance of the whole as against the part. Then there was a great dip in the curve of his chart indicating that from the fourteenth century until quite recently the situation had been completely reversing itself. Now the curve was once more turning upward, and my friend predicted that it had not yet reached its height, that perhaps in 1945 or 1950 this curve, which indicates the right of the whole as against the part, might reach once more its zenith; then he expected to see it straighten out once more in a renewed appreciation of the individual, the two ideals would balance, and we would obtain something of a perfect philosophy.

I think the man was essentially right from the standpoint of the philosopher. We are recognizing now, for instance, that "family" is a word which signifies a total group. Words like "father," "mother," "child," get their meaning from the collective term, "family," which gives to father, mother and child a status. The family is the unit which creates the vocation of husband, wife and child. It is not possible for the hand to say to the body, "I am of more importance than you are." For the hand is nothing apart from the body. It is the body which creates the vocation for the hand.

The same idea is becoming prevalent among ethical writers. Dr. Richard Cabot, in his *Meaning of Right and Wrong* (Macmillan Co., 1934), deals with those great agreements into which we enter with others to accomplish that which we cannot accomplish by ourselves. Ten, fifteen or twenty years ago, when a man wrote a book on ethics he started from the standpoint of the individual, examining the desires of the individual, asking what meant his happiness and what his source of duty. Now ethical philosophers start out by assuming society, not the individual, as the base line. They recognize what I think is true — that most of us can do very little by our own efforts. Most of what is worth while we do in company with other people.

When I was a young lad I lived an isolated life on a farm. I wanted to play baseball but there were no people to be organized into a ball team. There was an old straw shed on our farm and up against that I placed an image of a man who was supposed to represent a batter, and then I would get off the proper distance from the batter's plate and throw to the image. The ball would sink into the straw shed. I would retrieve it and throw it once more. It was my desperate attempt to make a baseball team out of one person. Of course it can't be done.

You cannot get an education by yourself. Education is a great co-operative adventure; libraries represent the collective wisdom of the past. The self-educated man does not exist.

You cannot through your efforts alone get your morn-

ing breakfast. Modern society is seeing more and more plainly that the feeding of the world is a great co-operative enterprise, and the man who looks upon that enterprise merely as something through which he can gain without contributing, is simply fooling himself.

You cannot travel alone; you must have great highways with their traffic lights and regulations. I noticed in the newspaper a few weeks ago that during the week-end one hundred and twenty-five people were killed on the highways of America. Why? I suspect many were killed because they did not recognize that traveling is a co-operative adventure. They were thinking of their own right to speed. They were pleased with their ability to dodge traffic lights and to cut in and out of the traffic. And one hundred and twenty-five deaths was the result.

Of course, you cannot have recreation alone. Most recreation is gained in terms of some game you enter into with other people, in which you must observe the rules of the game and be a good sport.

Thus we see a more social conception has come into all ethical thinking. We assume a society to start with, a whole so important that we find our place only as we participate in it. The same attitude is gaining ground in religion. For a hundred years we emphasized the right of people to organize any kind of religious group which seemed to them privately desirable. As a result, we have over two hundred denominations in the United States. We have been very reluctant to override the private right of others to organize their

separate branches of religious groups. But now we are saying: "You shall not crucify a community on the cross of your private desires in religion. The community has rights. If you are in the community as a church it is your business to serve the community, to respect its integrity, to work for its unity. You shall not crucify it on the cross of denominational glory." Thus, in all these various ways the principles of individualism are being modified by principles which grow out of convictions concerning the right of society as a whole.

Strange to say, little thinking in this direction has been done with reference to the family. We have not made the transition in family life that we have made in these other realms. We are still in the hands of individualists who do not see that, even as one cannot build political, economic and religious life on the doctrine of individualism, so one cannot build family life on that doctrine — and any persistent attempt to do so drives one toward futility. To indicate that this is not alone my theory, let me quote from at least one other contributor to thought in this realm. Ricarda Huch, in Keyserling's *Book of Marriage*, says:

The romanticists paid too little attention to the fact that man is ordained to establish communities which have priority over the rights of any one individual. (p. 193)

She is discussing the romantic marriage here. In another place this writer says:

The romanticists looked upon marriage as essentially a private marriage affecting two persons. It never struck them that society had an interest in such relationships and still less did they realize that it had a right to lay stress upon this point. We are at the summit of an individualistic age so far as marriage is concerned.

The democratic family needs a new social philosophy. That social philosophy must focus not on the individual but on those great agreements which complete the life of the individual and which make it possible for him to become a social person. Such a philosophy has been stated in Dr. Henry Churchill King's *The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine* (Macmillan Co., 1910). In applying the laws of associated living to the family, Dr. King says family life is not possible unless there is integrity of character, mutual self-revelation and answering trust, and a common fund of interests. In following such a philosophy there must be subordination of the rights of the individual in the interest of a larger good.

THE SELF-CENTERED MIND

RICHARD BAXTER was a prolific and tiresome writer on social ethics but he wrote to the point when he enumerated the sins most directly contrary to godliness. These sins are also contrary to all social conduct. They are: unbelief, hardness of heart, hypocrisy, inordinate man-pleasing, pride, covetousness and the master sin of sensuality, flesh-pleasing or voluptuousness. These major bad habits still thwart good social living. The following case record, covering the rise and fall of a contemporary family, testifies to the significance of Richard Baxter's insights:

When Dora finished high school it was her mother who insisted that she go to the university where she could continue with her music and at the same time acquire the culture which seemed to be demanded of modern young people. On matriculating at the university Dora discovered there was a chance to try out for the a cappella choir in the West Presbyterian Church. It was under the direction of a reputable voice teacher, and membership in his choir was equal to a course in voice training. She was not accepted until the following year, but once enrolled she made the best

use of the opportunity during the three remaining years.

While in the university she met David. The acquaintance grew into a romance. It seemed quite natural that she and David should be planning to get married shortly after their graduation. David had no plans for professional study, consequently the normal choice for him seemed to be that of joining his father in the telephone office. It was an opportunity for a job, and he needed a salary on which he and Dora could get married. His father's prestige gave him the opportunity he sought. Apparently everything was in his favor. When he and Dora were married the next fall, his father furnished their apartment for them. Was it any wonder that Dora's friends considered her a lucky girl?

Since Dora had been a member of the choir as a student, she was invited to continue when she made her new home in Mainton. It was a joy to resume this happy activity of student days, so Dora accepted as eagerly as when she first became a member. Singing regularly in West Church seemed to be an adequate reason for joining. When she united with the church on profession of faith, David transferred his letter from the downtown church where his father was an elder. The church now became a part of the home-making enterprise. Soon David was appointed an usher. The West Church was growing, and ushering was a particular task. He was proud of his ability to recognize faces and remember names, and he accepted his duties seri-

ously. They were enthusiastic young home-makers, who shared their happiness as only lovers can. Home-making was a beautiful new adventure.

Dora had to leave the choir a few months before George was born. The coming of the baby gave them a new interest, seemed to sanctify their affection and bind them more closely to each other. David found a new inducement to work at his job. He was promoted to more responsible positions and his salary was more than adequate for their needs. The first six years of their married life seemed almost ideal. With an adequate income, a wholesome group of friends and healthy church contacts, they had all the resources for a stable family life. They felt that they had laid well the foundations for a happy home.

About this time they thought it would be wise to enlarge their circle of friends. The small church group had become boresome to Dora. Her interest had waned since she stopped singing in the choir. She wanted wider associations. David also believed that a wider acquaintance would be good for both of them. The bridge club proved to be one outlet. They entertained frequently.

At first it was just a few friends in for an evening of bridge. When some of their new friends served liquor at their parties, it seemed to David and Dora that they must reciprocate. One could afford to be liberal in such things for the sake of friendship. When some of their old crowd frowned on such a procedure, the only result was further to alienate David and Dora

from their former companions and tie them more closely to the fast set.

It was not long before they were drinking too much. Everybody in their crowd was doing it and they seemed to be having a good time. David went on a stag party occasionally, leaving Dora at home with George. She resented this and it was the cause of their first quarrel. David refused to cut himself off from his convivial friends and told Dora that she ought not to deprive him of a little fun with the boys, so long as he provided well for her and George. Anyway he needed some relaxation while carrying the heavier burdens of his work.

David got to staying out all night now and then, but Dora did not care to have another quarrel; so she was patient and did not ask too many questions. Saturday night seemed to be a proper time for David's night out with the boys. Poker and liquor did not fit well into the church schedule on Sunday morning. David usually slept until noon on Sunday.

They kept George in Sunday school. When he was a little older he rebelled and said he wanted to stay home on Sunday "like Daddy." Dora tried to persuade George to go but did not offer to go with him. David decided that George did not need to go if he preferred to stay at home. He would not force the boy to comply with the rigid church discipline of his own youth. George had his own life to live and he would allow him to make up his own mind. David felt that this liberty had been denied him and he had

carried this resentment through the years. He had felt it all the more keenly of late since his parents had become concerned over their church neglect. The elder Grants had transferred their letters to the West Church hoping to maintain the family church interest. David saw through that. He wondered if the "old man" thought he could still dominate him as if he were a little boy. He would show his father that he had grown up. If he wanted to cut loose from the church he had a perfect right to do so. The sooner his father learned that, the better it would be for all of them.

His pastor, always regarded as an intimate friend, saw the trend of affairs and had a personal visit with David. He tried to appeal to David for the sake of his son. David explosively told his pastor of his growing resentment toward his rigid training and affirmed that his own son would never be subjected to the same church tyranny that he had endured. He exaggerated some of the main points and felt that he had been able to make out a pretty good case for himself. He and Dora would let George make his own decisions about religion. In the end he would probably be a better church man than his father. David was sure he had proved his point.

When Dora heard that David had been seen at a roadhouse with a young woman when he was supposed to have been at an all-night stag party, she was not surprised. She had suspected it for some time, but had gone on with their crowd, closing her eyes to the

facts she feared. The evidence was now conclusive. She decided that she and David must come to terms. Their life could not go on as it had been. She loved George too much to allow the dissolution of their home. She resolved to have a frank talk with David. If he would not agree to break off his relations with this adventuress, she would demand the same privileges for herself. She was still young, was not lacking in physical charm, and she knew several men who would not be averse to her advances. She was certain that such a proposal would bring David to his senses, and that he would be furious over the prospect of her loose conduct.

He admitted the truth of the rumors which she had heard, but showed no signs of penitence or willingness to give up his affair. Wounded to the heart, but still defiant, Dora demanded her freedom as she had resolved to do. Much to her surprise David acquiesced. He said it would be all right with him as long as she did not interfere with his affairs.

Apparently there was nothing for Dora to do but to carry out her threat. She still hoped that David would relent when he saw that she meant to go on with her proposal. Her threat was easy to carry out. It was not long until she too was spending the night away from home. George, left much to himself, got into trouble. He and a group of other young men were arrested for stealing an automobile. Since neither his father nor mother could be reached, George thought it might be a good idea to call their pastor.

David and Dora seemed to be somewhat sobered by this event, but neither of them would give in to the other. The minister thought it was time to talk again with Dora. He accomplished nothing. She admitted the truth of all he said but would make no promises. To his final question, "Dora, what about the future?" she replied, "I do not allow myself to think about the future." George was now a real problem. David and Dora gave some serious consideration to his welfare but came to no agreement about their own conduct. They agreed to send George to military school. It seemed the easiest way out. They would then be free to follow their own wishes for the greater part of the year.

The telephone company was now deeply concerned over David's dissipation. His office duties were being neglected. The habits he had developed and the reputation he had acquired were not regarded as helpful assets. However, it was difficult to discharge him in view of his father's flawless record. In a private conference of the directors, in which the elder Grant was invited to participate, it was decided to make David district manager in Hicktown, a small city one hundred miles distant. This would get him and Dora away from the fast set and give them a chance to straighten out their tangled lives. It was a distinct demotion, with the understanding that he was being given another chance. If he and Dora decided to break off their present associations and start afresh it was assumed that he would again be in line for promotion.

There was a scene when David broke the news to Dora. She vowed that she would never leave Manton. David could go to the little "hick town" if he wanted to. She would stay among her friends and expect David to support her and George. David adopted a rare mood of calm. He refused to get excited. His job was at stake. He could not afford to lose control of himself. He wanted Dora to look at the situation as a business proposition. Dora had made it clear that she did not love him any more. She had an admirer with whom she spent as much time as he could give her. It was a killing pace that she was going and she knew it. Once it was started there seemed no place to stop. Here was a chance to stop but she did not want to. David's mood finally won with Dora. She was willing to accept his proposition. For the sake of appearances she would go as his wife to Hicktown, on certain conditions. She demanded that he secure an apartment at the best hotel where separate living quarters could be provided for them. They could share a common reception and living room, but she must have a separate bedroom and kitchenette. This arrangement would enable her to entertain the men who came to visit her, and still maintain the semblance of marital respectability.

David was disappointed. He had begun to tire of the fast life. He realized that he could not keep his job and keep up the pace he and Dora were traveling. He had hoped that Dora would be willing to join him in the effort to reinstate himself. Since she would not

do so, he agreed to the conditions she imposed, hoping that he could eventually win her back. But Dora adhered to her original proposition. It was only for the sake of a respectable appearance that she had come. She would abide by the agreement as a business proposition. She was willing to appear at public functions with her husband and live in the same apartment with him, but she declined to perform the functions of a wife any longer. Her admirer in Mainton was near enough for frequent visits, and she preferred to share the intimacies of a wife with him.

When David was transferred to Hicktown the president of the telephone company wrote the local pastor of the Presbyterian church and opened the way for a church contact. The pastor and his wife called on the Grants shortly after they were settled at the hotel. An old fraternity brother of David's in Hicktown used his influence in trying to establish church connections for them. The president of the Presbyterian Woman's Guild took Dora to their semi-monthly meeting in an effort to establish new friendships. To all church overtures the Grants were unresponsive. They let it be known that they had not been much interested in church for some time and had no intention of joining a church until they found the group of friends who appealed to them. Apparently nothing could be accomplished by pressing the invitation, so the pastor and members of the Presbyterian church continued to be friendly and interested, but David and Dora always had other engagements which prevented their attendance at church functions.

Dora's unwillingness to co-operate and the lure of old associations led David to find some congenial women friends, with whom he shared the privacy of his bedroom. It was an arrangement that was doomed to failure from the start. The Grants were soon the scandal of the town. Gossip traveled faster there than it did in Mainton. Dora was out of town most of the following summer with George. David was seen frequently with a divorcée of unsavory reputation. Tongues wagged a little faster after these evidences of growing estrangement. Notices still appeared regularly in the society columns stating that "Mr. David Grant spent the week-end with Mrs. Grant and George at their summer home in Minnesota." But the gossips could not be fooled. In David's new liaison they saw evidences of a family failure.

After George had gone back to military academy in the fall, it was plain to the Grants that the sham could be continued no longer in Hicktown. They talked it over and agreed that Dora should file for a divorce. The divorce was granted on the ground of incompatibility and Dora returned to Mainton where she might be able to see her lover more frequently.

After the divorce David held his job under protest of several members of the board of directors. Under this pressure he was forced to resign. He made a statement to the local daily paper to the effect that he had had this change under consideration for several months. He advised his friends that he had accepted an insurance agency and would be pleased to serve them in that capacity.

According to the news that comes "over the grapevine" David will probably marry the divorcée. His parents, greatly disappointed over the failure of the home, have maintained a remarkable composure. They visit frequently with Dora and want her to marry the man she prefers to their son.

Here is a family in which neither poverty nor race nor class tension is a problem. The family breaks up through lack of mutual consideration, self-control and a common purpose for something higher than the personal likes and dislikes of a man and woman. They could have been helped if for them victory over pride, hypocrisy and sensuality had been achievable.

In sexual relationships, the recourse of men to prostitutes must be looked upon as the most extreme assertion of individualism. The men who frequent houses of ill repute are demanding for themselves a life of special privilege in abrogation of one of the great agreements of life to which they have been socially pledged in loyalty. Here is the point where individualism becomes immoderately, violently antisocial. Back in 1911, after a thorough investigation of conditions in the city by the Chicago Vice Report, the interpretative *Social Evil in Chicago* was shocked by the results of the findings into saying:

. . . There is only one moral law — it is alike for men and women. . . . There is a contract called matrimony which is a solemn contract between those who love. It carries with it the ele-

ments of vested rights—even a solemn promise before God. . . . Has this contract been kept inviolate? If not, why not?

To one who hears the ghastly life story of fallen women, it is ever the same—the story of treachery, seduction and downfall—the flagrant act of man—the ruin of a soul by man.

It is a man and not a woman problem which we face today—commercialized by man—supported by man—the supply of fresh victims furnished by men—men who have lost that fine instinct of chivalry and that splendid honor for womanhood where the destruction of a woman's soul is abhorrent, and where the defense of a woman's purity is truly the occasion for a valiant fight.

URBAN AND RURAL ATOMISM

URBAN LIFE does not socialize; it tends to individualize. Hence the modern city is hard on the family. In fact, it is hard on all the human associative functions, on politics, education — on all except the function for which it was formed: commerce. But it seems to be especially hard on the family because the relationships within the family are so much more delicately balanced than those within any other associative bodies.

The city is the monumental accomplishment of three hundred years of individualistic capitalism. Since 1800 ever larger cities have arisen, each decade adding to the percentage of the population that lives in them. Europe has changed from three per cent urban to more than fifty per cent. Great industrial nations have seen an increasing number of their populations in urban environments. The United States, which in 1800 had an urban population of 210,873 (3.97 per cent of the total population), saw that figure grow until one hundred years later over thirty million lived in cities — over 40 per cent of the total. In 1790 there were six cities in the country with a population of eight thousand; in

1880 the number had increased to 285. In 1920 there were 2,254 cities with a population of 2,500 or over, and by 1930 there were 2,710 in that bracket.

There is nothing mysterious about this growth of cities. The coming of the great city accompanied the rise to power of trader, manufacturer, moneylender and professional classes. The city is just one-third of the social process. It arises at that point where the resources of great agricultural hinterlands are tied in by lines of transportation to industrial centers where the raw materials of farm, forest and mine are processed in factories.

City men have managed to reward themselves liberally for the services which they perform. For every bushel of wheat which comes to the consumer's table in the shape of loaves of bread, two-thirds of the price has been taken by the city men. This is true of fourteen major products of the farm that go to feed the hungry masses in the city. For three hundred years city men have found increasingly profitable their role of middleman. In 1927 the average farmer in the milk shed of Chicago, for the labor of his whole family and an investment on a twelve thousand dollar farm plant, received about twenty-seven dollars a week.* The member of the milk wagon drivers' union in the city, for working eight hours a day, received fifty dollars a week plus commission. A government audit of the companies which distributed this milk to the city con-

* *Rural-Urban Relations in Chicago*, Dairy District Information Service, Federal Council of Churches, Vol. VII, no. 44.

sumer revealed that during the first three years of the depression they made a 25 per cent return on their investment. There is nothing mysterious about this accumulation of population in the cities.

But this is not the whole story.

The city is witnessing the biological collapse of the family. The divorce figure in the city far exceeds that in the country. Chicago has one divorce for every 4.9 marriages, which is just about twice the rate for down-state Illinois. The high rate of divorce in the city corresponds to the fact that the city is a place where social organization disintegrates. All social institutions are cracking under the stress and strain of urban life. Families are disorganized where churches and schools and neighborhood life are also disorganized.

Cities are places of few children. The suburbs of Chicago have about half enough children to replace their population. In six cities of the United States largely of American stock, there were only about 225 children per 1,000 women in 1930, a deficit of about 36 per cent below the number needed to maintain population permanently stationary without accessions from outside. In all the large cities (those over 100,000 population) taken as a whole, the deficit was about 22 per cent and in the smaller cities of 2,500 to 100,000 population the deficit was about 8 per cent. In the rural non-farm population, on the other hand — that is, people living in places of less than 2,500 population and in the open country but not on farms — there was a surplus of children of about 30 per cent, and in the rural

farm population the surplus was nearly 50 per cent. Urban deficit was slightly exceeded by rural surplus in 1930 — that is, there were enough children in the nation to cause a very slow increase of population without immigration from abroad. (For statistics, see Department of Agriculture bulletin, *Population Trends and National Welfare*, 1934.)

The low birth rate in the city seems to be due to the fact that people are willing to sacrifice the bearing of children to social pleasure. Moreover, children are expensive in the city, and city pavements are hazardous for them. Above all else, the atmosphere of the city and the factory is not conducive to healthy family life. It would seem that we must discover some way of distributing our population in the more open spaces of the country if they are to bear a vigorous and numerous human stock. A civilization which builds great cities will have to face the fact that thus far cities have not yet performed the most essential function in national life — namely, an adequate reproduction of the national stock.

Unemployment — voluntary or enforced — in the city, and poverty on the farm due to over-exploitation of the farmer by the city middlemen, are great individualizers. Both mean for the individual ostracism from the normal social life of the community. On the farm, poverty may be seen as a form of unemployment, representing as it does in most cases waste of time and energy in terms of inadequate returns. Erskine Caldwell's *Tobacco Road* is overdrawn, it is repulsive; but

to a great extent it is deplorably true. The following picture of the sharecropper's family published in *The Advance*, December, 1935, shows family life reduced to using all energy for the purpose of making a bare living. There is neither the time nor the means for building up meaningful social relationships:

The family is composed of Mr. and Mrs. Hart and seven children, four boys and three girls between the ages of twenty-two and nine. Mr. Hart rents a farm "on halves" from Mr. Reed, who furnishes a house, a garden plot, wood for the cutting, two mules, and half the fertilizer. The government allows this farm 1,100 pounds of lint cotton and eight acres of cotton land. This large allotment is made because it is a two-mule farm, as both Mr. Hart and the nineteen-year-old boy can plow. The oldest son is married and lives away from home. In addition to the cotton acreage, Mr. Hart gets nine acres which he puts in corn and cane, and four acres of pasture. There are also thirteen acres in woodland, about one for garden and potatoes, and some waste land.

The house contains three rooms. Mr. and Mrs. Hart and the two older boys sleep in the front room; the three girls and the youngest boy in the second room. The house is rickety, unplastered and unprotected, and they all suffer from the cold in the winter. The roof leaks, so that the beds are often wet. There are plank shutters rather than

glass in the windows and the family sits in darkness all winter, or leaves the door open and "tries to heat all out of doors." The fireplace in the front room can hardly warm eight people, and the cook-stove in the kitchen isn't much good. There is not a cupboard or closet in the house.

The Harts have few clothes except the insufficient ones on their backs. All go barefoot all summer. The older girls are ashamed of their appearance, and run to hide if they hear anyone coming, but Mrs. Hart's feet are so swollen that she no longer cares. The school is more than two miles away, and the children have to walk in all kinds of weather, when they go at all. They have never gone regularly, being sick a good deal, and they can't start in on the first of September, having to stay home to pick cotton.

We have recently witnessed the disintegration of family life under widespread unemployment. Hearings held among the unemployed in Chicago brought forth abundant testimony to the relationship of the two. Day after day people came in and told the effects of unemployment upon their family life. There was stealing of food, fuel and various kinds of merchandise, the breaking open of padlocked gas and electric light outlets, the use of every variety of deception to obtain more adequate aid from charitable agencies. People who would have shunned such activity a few years ago now entered into it without hesitation. I

quote the following brief statements, every one of which reflects the disorganization which depression brings on:

[By a woman] If I could only have just one meal that my husband has bought, the food for it would taste so much better.

* * *

I was brought up with the understanding that honesty was the best policy. I have existed, for the past several months, under a condition where if I were honest, it would not be a virtue but a deliberate sin, inasmuch as it would deprive my children of the necessary food.

* * *

The other day my gas was shut off. I went to work and shut the meter off and plugged in and got gas. I have stolen coal. You may wonder how that has affected my mind. A year or two ago if I had seen somebody holding up somebody else I might have risked my life to stop it. Today I would say, "I hope he has a big fat politician by the neck and kills him, or a big fat banker."

* * *

I told my wife I would get the money [for rent] one day when I was a little emotional and hysterical; in other words, I told her that I knew where

there was a gun. She said, "Don't be crazy," that people who killed themselves had not gotten anywhere. I said that I was not going to kill myself, that I was going out and get some money for the rent. I have done everything possible to maintain my credit and live like a man and cannot do it. Then I have to do something else.

* * *

I moved four places. The charities paid one month's rent and said, "You stay here a while." I stayed there for two months and then got put out. I got shipped to another place. This place they won't put me out. Let them try. I've made up my mind. I moved four places already and I won't move again. If I have to go out and rob, I am going to do it. I didn't have anything to eat this morning. I went to the National Tea and took a loaf of bread, went to another grocery store and got a jar of jam and that is what I had for breakfast this morning. I am not ashamed to say it. As long as I have to have something to eat I will get it if I have to rob.

* * *

[By a minister] I might say that some of the men have told me frankly that they were stealing coal. I have not the heart to rebuke them or pass any moral judgment on them.

* * *

At the other end of the social scale we may read the sensational news of the society columns which indicates that another type of unemployment — voluntary leisure of social parasites — leaves the family without the moral fiber necessary to its survival.

THE SURRENDER OF ROMANCE

CRITICS OF the bourgeois marriage often refer to it as marriage built around property. A. W. Calhoun's *Social History of the American Family* back in 1917 pointed out that much of the sanctity of the family now rests on a regard for property inherited through family channels which necessitates that these channels be kept continuous and free from confusion.

There is much evidence for the extreme view that marriage in the West operates under the law of economic determinism, and for the moderate view that the romantic marriage is modified in all its behavior by economic conditions; but there is still more evidence for the position that romantic love rises above economic considerations.

The early development of family life in the United States was linked to the development of a pioneer country. The fact that there were no great fortunes in itself leveled the barriers of caste and class and made democratic choice possible. Transportation was limited, which meant that marriage took place inside sectional lines—but not necessarily within class lines. The economic motive was often clearly present, how-

ever, in that young romantics often had an eye for economic ability to create the fortunes yet to be made. The classic statement of this attitude appeared in Horace Bushnell's *Age of Homespun*, an address given at a centennial celebration in Litchfield, Connecticut, in 1851. Here we have romance conditioned by consideration of economic ability and finally succumbing to it as a dominant motive when fortunes have accumulated:

Descending from the topic of society in general to one more delicate, that of marriage and the tender passion and the domestic felicities of the homespun age, the main distinction here to be noted is that marriages were commonly contracted at a much earlier period in life than now. Not because the habit of the time was more romantic or less prudential, but because a principle more primitive and closer to the beautiful simplicity of nature was yet in vogue, viz. that women are given by the Almighty, not so much to help their husbands spend a living as to help them get one. Accordingly, the ministers were always very emphatic, as I remember, in their marriage ceremonies, on the ancient idea that the woman was given to the man to be a helpmeet for him. . . . What more beautiful embodiment is there on this earth of true sentiment than the young wife who has given herself to a man in his weakness to make him strong; to enter into the hard battle of his life and bear the

brunt of it with him; to go down with him in disaster if he fails and cling to him for what he is; to rise with him, if he rises, and share a two-fold joy with him in the competence achieved; remembering, both of them, how it grew, by little and little, and by what methods of frugal industry it was nourished; having it also, not as his, but theirs, the reward of their common perseverance, and the token of their consolidated love. And if this be the most heroic sentiment in the woman, it certainly was no fault in the man of homespun to look for it.

This mingling of romance and economic ability in many cases was as wholesome as the social life of which it was a part.

But this regard for the economic often moved on to something less lovely. An illustrative statement of this latter situation can be found in Elizabeth Drexel Lehr's *King Lehr and the Gilded Age* (J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1935), a book which for a long time to come will furnish evidence for those who argue that bourgeois marriage is a marriage for property.

When, about twenty-five years ago, Harry Lehr, then the most popular bachelor in New York, became engaged to Elizabeth Drexel, he was not averse to telling her that he was poor and that he expected her riches to ease this condition. Liking him all the better for his frankness, the girl had her lawyers draw up an agreement whereby her husband-to-be would receive

twenty-five thousand dollars a year as pocket money, and in which she also undertook to pay all the expenses of their life together.

After dinner, on their wedding eve, Elizabeth wrote ecstatically in her diary of Harry's cleverness, wit and beautiful manners. The mood of exhilaration lasted until she stood before the altar in a fashionable New York church where, with the eyes of society upon her, she felt a vague sense of foreboding, and after the ceremony she observed, prophetically enough, that the bright sky had become overcast.

At a hotel in Baltimore all the arrangements had been completed for their wedding supper which was to include Harry's favorite foods. Beside his plate lay a gold and enamel watch. As the bride put the finishing touches to her toilet, her maid entered with the astounding news that Mr. Lehr had given orders that he was to dine alone. Elizabeth's feelings can well be imagined, but she forced herself to speak lightly and gave a headache as the excuse for her husband's extraordinary behavior.

He came in a few minutes later and asked if she had heard of his orders to the servants. The girl, frightened by his pale, serious face, her lips too dry to speak, could only nod affirmatively. Without further preliminaries the man she had married only a few hours before proceeded to destroy all her romantic dreams of happy marriage, and to kill her faith and love with a few caustic, well-chosen words. He informed her that he did not love her and never could love her. In public he would treat her with all def-

erence and apparent devotion, but in private he wished to see as little of her as possible.

When, scarcely above a whisper, she asked the natural question, "Why did you marry me?" he replied, with such bitterness in his voice that she recoiled:

Dear lady, do you really know so little of the world that you have never heard of people being married for their money, or did you imagine that your charms placed you above such a fate? Since you force me to do so I must tell you the unflattering truth that your money is your only asset in my eyes. I married you because the only person on earth I love is my mother. I wanted above everything to keep her in comfort. Your father's fortune will enable me to do so. But there is a limit to sacrifice. I cannot condemn myself to the misery of playing the role of adoring lover for the rest of my life.

He went on in a somewhat more amiable tone to point out the advantages of her position as his wife, which would give her a leading role in society, but, when she made no attempt at speech, he continued somewhat irritably:

I suppose I am what the novelists would call an adventurer. I am not ashamed of it. I would do more than I have done for the sake of my mother. If you will try to accustom yourself to the position and realize from the start that there

is no romance and never can be any between us, I believe that we shall get along quite well together. But for God's sake leave me alone. Do not come near me except when we are in public, or you will force me to repeat to you the brutal truth that you are actually repulsive to me.

Elizabeth Lehr's happiness had been swept away by that amazing interview, but pride came to her rescue. She entered upon her role as Harry Lehr's gay, socialite wife, and her days and nights were crowded with engagements. As he had promised, in public Harry was the personification of devoted attentiveness, but in private he consistently avoided his wife, beyond an occasional grudging phrase as to her ability as a hostess. And this state of things continued for the length of their married life, about twenty-five years!

A third stage in this development is that reflected in John K. Winkler's *The Du Pont Dynasty* (Reynal & Hitchcock, 1935). Here the descendants of the Du Ponts in America are pictured as an occidental "larger family" made up of grandfathers, aunts and uncles, parents, sons and daughters, who live together in contiguous areas and show such a decided tendency to marry inside the clan that the clan elders have found it necessary to forbid intermarriage between kinship groups. This might be called clan individualism.

The Du Ponts are a great, sprawling family. Yet the several hundred individuals making up the

clan have held surprisingly close to the manners, customs and traditions of their French bourgeois origin. They have sunk their transplanted roots in one section and one soil, cultivating the same acres and inhabiting the same houses generation after generation. There are twenty or more Du Pont estates within an hour's ride of Wilmington. . . . For a century these people lived so much within themselves that, considering the largeness of their family, consanguine marriages were the natural result. . . . Inbreeding among the Du Ponts has brought out both recessive and dominant traits, as the biologists term them. There have been erratic, abnormal, insane individuals among the Du Ponts, though the percentage has not been higher, perhaps, than the statistical average. Colonel Henry du Pont, as *pater familias*, years ago forbade further cousin marriages. Pierre in turn has tried to enforce the dictum, though he himself married a first cousin.

To this list of illustrations can be added the social register built up on property lines, the clubs and churches which are so expensive that only the rich can join, and the colleges and private schools which are attended by people of established income. In view of the mass of evidence of this kind, it is not difficult for one to conclude that the democratic marriage which freed itself from the considerations of caste and class laid itself at the feet of the chamber of commerce.

PART THREE

IMPROVING THE DEMOCRATIC
FAMILY

VIII

THE PROBLEM FACING THE ROMANTIC MARRIAGE

THE ROMANTIC marriage and the democratic family form the emotional and ethical core of the Western democratic movement. All the families of the world are moving in the direction of the romantic marriage. This is true of the Orient; it has very largely been accomplished in Europe; and in the West there does not seem to be any weakening of the conviction that young men and women should maintain in their own hands the right to make decisions in their intimate love affairs. Furthermore, this democratic family is so closely intertwined with the political and social organization of the West that it constitutes a fixed point from which the social and economic structure can be surveyed. Indeed, one may venture the suggestion that regard for the democratic family may determine the economic structure in the future more than the economic structure will determine the nature of the family. It is entirely possible that what we finally decide to do about property will be determined by our convictions about the way we wish to organize in families.

It is not likely that the world is going to give up the emotional and ethical gains which have come with the

democratic family. The future of democratic marriage is therefore not called in question here. The question raised in this chapter pertains to those improvements of it which are now being advocated, and with the changes which are likely to be made in it as modern democracy faces the issues of the future. Briefly stated, the real problem is: How can democratic marriage be rescued from death at the hands of its co-partners, democratic individualism and capitalism, without falling a victim to a totalitarian state?

Fifty years ago the church was facing the crisis created by the inroads which the vices of a pioneer society — intemperance, prostitution, gambling and ignorance — were making on the family. These social scourges still exist, and must be fought. The growth of gambling and the probable growth of intemperance may once more make these live issues in Western life. But these are not the issues of most importance to those who are concerned with the fate of the Western family.

Neither is the problem of making democratic marriage more individualistic the most vital one at the present time. It is probably true that democracy has not yet done its perfect work inside the family. There are many who feel that the democratic principle has arrived late in family life, and with the spirit of social crusaders they believe that the family needs most of all an extension of the democratic spirit. So Judge Lindsey comes forward with his book on *Companionate Marriage* (Boni & Liveright, 1927), in which we find the following explanation:

Companionate marriage is legal marriage with legalized birth control, and with the right to divorce by mutual consent for childless couples, usually without payment of alimony. Companionate marriage is a program which proposes to legalize, stabilize and direct certain of the customs, privileges and practices of modern marriage, practices which are already in widespread use, but which have no legal status or direction (Intro., p. 5).

Divorce would be granted only after a court of domestic relations has failed in a human and scientific effort at reconciliation. Alimony would not be that arbitrary legal right of the wife, as it is at present in so many states, but would be allowed when, in the judgment of the court, circumstances justified it. Education by state agencies of youth and married couples in the art of love, the laws of sex and life, would be made available. Both parties to a physical contract would be required to undergo physical examination. Judge Lindsey argues for his program:

Companionate marriage is already an established social fact in this country. It is conventionally respectable. Sophisticated people are, without incurring social reproach, everywhere practicing birth control and are also obtaining collusive divorces outside the law whenever they want it. They will continue to practice and no amount of prohibition can stop them. My thought is that

we should put an end to the hypocritical pretense under which we profess one thing and do another, that the companionate marriage, now largely monopolized by educated people who understand contraceptive devices, ought to be made legally and openly available to all people, particularly to the poor and socially unfit who need it most. To protest against the colossal phenomenon is like trying to stop the tide by scolding it. I suggest that if we rationalize this new thing and use it intelligently we may be able to derive from it a degree of social and spiritual power capable of creating for our descendants a better world than we have been able to fashion for our own use and happiness. This is clearly one more step in emphasizing the principle of individual right in the organization of the marriage relationship.

But there are still those who wish to go much further than Judge Lindsey in the perfection of the principle of individualism as applied to marriage. They feel that, though the law allows very great freedom, and should allow more in democratizing the modern home, marriage itself still operates under a tradition of mystery, of awe, of a certain kind of authoritarianism which grows out of ignorance and inability to control the situation; therefore, they advocate the removal of all mystery, ignorance and what might be called the casualties of nature in the matter. Only then, they believe, will the democratic principle find itself.

Many hope for much improvement from greater

frankness regarding sex knowledge and sex practices. Certain modern psychiatrists maintain that if we could teach people that conception is preventable, venereal diseases curable, divorces obtainable and God impossible, we could greatly improve the spirit and practice of the democratic marriage. In other words, the psychiatrist would improve the family by accentuating or placing even more emphasis upon individualism than already exists.

Although I am inclined to agree that marriage still operates in a man-dominated world and under too much of a sense of mystery and fear, I believe it is useless to attempt to improve the democratic family by starting from this point of view. Psychiatrists and social reformers are scarcely beginning to deal with the crucial issues which the democratic family must face in the immediate future; they persist in focusing attention on trivial and, to a certain extent, outworn phases of the family problem.

Western democratic marriage faces biological futility at the hands of capitalism's most notable achievement — the modern city — and social disintegration at the hands of an individualism which is largely the product of modern democracy. The problems of the future will be, not how to prevent children from being born or how to secure a divorce in a church-ridden society, but how to build adequate families which will produce enough children to continue the career of the race, and how to make the family an integral part of a great spiritual will to live without subordinating it to the state.

INSIDE THE FAMILY CIRCLE

LET US TRY to understand the social nature of the family. As far back as the middle of the last century, Horace Bushnell pointed out that the family is both the agent and the object of salvation. Families are societies of mutual dependence which establish roles for people in the most sensitive period of their lives. How father, mother, brothers and sisters condition one another is the crucial issue in family life. The Old Testament tells the story of Jacob who, because he favored his son Joseph, made the latter conceited and his brothers envious:

Now Jacob loved Joseph more than all of his children because he was the son of his old age, and he made him a coat of many colors. And when his brethren saw that their father loved him more than all his brethren, they hated him and could not speak peaceably unto him. And Joseph dreamed a dream and he told his brethren and they hated him yet the more. And he said unto them, "Hear, I pray you, this dream which I have dreamed, for behold, we were binding sheaves in

the field and lo, my sheaf rose and also stood upright and behold your sheaves stood round about and made obeisance to my sheaf." And his brethren said to him "Shalt thou indeed reign over us or shalt thou indeed have dominion over us?" And they hated him yet the more for his dreams and for his words. And he dreamed yet another dream and told his brethren and said, "Behold I have dreamed a dream more and behold the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me." And he told it to his father and to his brethren and his father rebuked him and said, "Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?" And his brethren envied him but his father observed the saying.

This story of a weak, doting father and the havoc he wrought has been repeated with countless variations through the ages. When parents play favorites they devastate a child's world. The intensity of the anguish which this practice produces in the unfavored bears witness to the delicacy of the fabric out of which the family is woven.

A family is a community of mutual dependence in matters far more intimately related to the individual than are politics and business. When a man and a woman join in the relationship of marriage, they establish a community about which both are inevitably sensitive. After a woman has given her most intimate

self to a man, a relationship has been established in which each member of this community holds the other's fate in custody, and over each hangs the perpetual threat of being accounted a failure in the other's eyes. When children come into the picture this community of mutual dependence is enlarged. A child, feeling that he is not a success in the eyes of his parents, easily develops an acute sense of inferiority.

The family, then, is a society of appreciation. It roots first of all in the attraction of the sexes for each other. The Romeo and Juliet experience should be the basic appreciation experience for every family; but it should ripen into the larger and more mature appreciation which, in a very real sense, makes the family a society in which people redeem one another through appreciation and devotion. Just as it is possible for one to destroy another's life through refusing to give a loving self-revelation which will evoke an answering response, so it is possible, by a love which is more than temporary passion, for husband and wife and parents and children to lift each other up to an exaltation which is truly redemptive. Such was the secret of the relationship of Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett. Such is the story of redemptive love which St. Paul applauds in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

A family is a society with habits and ritual. It is interwoven with other agencies, as the school, church and the economic order. The story of the Puritan family, given by Professor George H. Palmer of Harvard University in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*,

1921, offers an illustration which may seem extreme, but is eloquent of the part ritual and symbolism may play, and often still do play in family life:

My father was a Boston merchant who had come from the country and by diligence had climbed to a competence. In our home all was plain and solid. There was no luxury. Expenditure was carefully studied, and waste incessantly fought. But we had all that was needed for comfort and dignity, and on all that we possessed and did religion set its mark. To exhibit that ever-present influence, I trace the course of a single day.

On rising I read a chapter of the Bible and had a prayer by myself. Then to breakfast, where each of the family repeated a verse of scripture, my father afterward asking a blessing on the meal. No meal was taken without this benediction. When breakfast was ended, the servants were summoned to family prayers, which ended with the Lord's Prayer, repeated together.

Then we children were off to school, which was opened with Bible reading and prayer. Of school there were two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, so that our principal play time was between four thirty and six o'clock, with study around the family table after supper. Later in the evening when the servants' work was done, they joined us once more at family prayers; after which we children kissed each member of the

family and departed to bed, always however, before undressing, reading a chapter of the Bible by ourselves and offering an accompanying prayer. Each day, therefore, I had six seasons of Bible-reading and prayer — two in the family, two by myself, and two at school; and this in addition to the threefold blessing of the food. No part of the day was without consecration. The secular and the sacred were completely intertwined.

Permeated thus as was every day with divine suggestion, it may be said that on Sunday our very conversation was in the heavens. On that day the labor of the servants was lightened, so that they, too, might rest and attend church. Many household cares were then thrown upon us children, and it was arranged that there should be little cooking. But while play and labor ceased and solemnity reigned, it was an approved and exalting solemnity; for then occurred two preaching services and a session of Sunday school.

To me the day was one of special happiness, because my father was then at home and during almost every hour of the day he was his children's companion. We gathered about him for cheerful talk after breakfast and after the noon dinner he usually read to us from the *Pilgrim's Progress*, or some other benign and attractive book. After supper the whole family assembled in the parlor and when each one present had repeated a hymn or poem, we had an hour of music — solos on the

piano by the girls and familiar hymns sung without book by the entire company.

Toward the end of the evening my father was apt to put his arm around one of the children and draw him into the library for a half-hour's private talk. Blessed and influential sessions these, serving the purpose of the Roman confessional! As frank as that and as peace-bringing, but freed from its formality, with no other authority recognized than a common allegiance to a Heavenly Father, the independence of us little ones guarded by the abounding wisdom, tenderness, trust and even playfulness of our adored companion.

Such unceasing presence in the Puritan home of the religious motive might easily have become unwholesome and enfeebling, had it not been attended by several other powerful influences which diversified it and enriched the nature to which religion gave stability. As these supporting interests are generally overlooked by those who censure the Puritan home, I name a few of them.

To the family tie the Puritans gave great prominence. Marriage was a sacrament, and the family a divine institution, where each member was charged with the well-being of all. In my own family there was little authoritative restriction. With father and mother we children were on terms of tender and reverential intimacy. They joined us in our games, were sharers in our studies, friendships and aspirations. To them we expressed

freely our half-formed thoughts. If one of them took a journey, one of us was pretty sure to be a companion.

In a family where there were few servants, each of us took part in household duties. There were rooms to be set in order, wood to be split, errands to be run. The older children must wait on the younger. In this way all were drawn together by common cares. Brothers and sisters became close friends. Affection was deep and openly expressed. With no fear of sentimentality we kissed one another often, always on going to bed, on rising and usually when leaving the house for even a few hours. We were generous with our small pocket monies and wept when the ending vacation carried away to boarding-school a member of our group. The Puritan home cannot be rightly estimated without noting the tenacity of family affection, which its devout atmosphere directly contributed to induce.

The point I have endeavored to stress in this section is that the relationships between members of a family are very delicately adjusted based as they are on mutual dependence. In any attempt to change family life, these peculiar relationships must be carefully considered.

SOCIALIZING THE FAMILY

THE POINT of view of this book can be stated in a few words: people who are entering into the family relationship should realize that they are building little societies within a democratic world which itself depends on a collective conviction. This point of view stands by contrast against the creation of families by passion, by parental decision or by divine fiat; let us call it creation of families by *conviction*.

In a discussion of Oriental families, I described what might be called families by paternalistic decision. Those entering into the family were relieved of the necessity of holding any convictions beyond those handed to them by tradition and the decisions of the elders.

The commonly accepted Catholic and Protestant marriage ceremony has a phrase, "Whom God hath joined together. . . ." Were we to take that phrase literally, as many have done, we would have a clear case of what might be called families by divine fiat. God, in this case, has taken the place of the paternalistic matchmaker in the Oriental marriage. At the opposite extreme we have the little better known marriage by passion and the drift of circumstances.

Families by conviction are those made by people who enter into the relationship through an understanding of both its personal and social significance, not through compulsion of custom or of paternalism, human or divine. I do not believe that the matter with which I am here concerned is primarily the business of the doctor or psychoanalyst, as many maintain it is. These professionals seldom come in contact with the great mass of families, and then only when families are in trouble. The building of the conviction which must lie at the base of family life must be the work of those who establish social ideals and attitudes — namely, the clergy, the educators and others who deal with the mass of human beings who are looking forward toward the major activities of life. People who establish families by conviction will not only have a conviction about the birth of children, but also about the relationships of husband, wife and children to one another and their collective relationships to their family and the world outside — a world which is made up of those groups and institutions which serve the total human welfare.

Family life is a series of achieved functional relationships between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister. We should recognize first of all that the husband-wife relationship displaces a highly competitive relationship between the sexes. Between this competitive relationship and marriage, there is a period of semi-competition known as the engagement period, when the mutual claim of two people upon each other is neither so binding as marriage nor so

free as the period of sex competition. It is a period when either party to an engagement should have the right to withdraw without dishonor. A clearer recognition of this right might prevent many an unsatisfactory marriage. But marriage itself belongs to another world than that of sex competition. The attempt to introduce competition into this new world rightly opens one to the charge of committing a social misdemeanor worthy of public and private punishment.

The argument for stabilizing the sex relationship on a noncompetitive basis must lie in the larger values to be sought as two people attempt to establish together those values which cannot be otherwise achieved. They must, with conviction, forego those excitements which characterize an earlier period. Mr. Elton Mayo, in *Harper's Magazine*, March, 1936, wrote an article on "Should Marriage Be Monotonous?" His answer is in the affirmative; it should be as monotonous as statesmanship, more monotonous than revolution. What he has in mind is that the setting up of family life calls for the building of a society rather than the romantic seeking of excitement.

A successful family life is a harmony developed out of diversity. Not to recognize this fact is to invite failure. Husband and wife not only bring to each other that unfulfilled destiny of sex for which each alone is inadequate, but they probably bring to each other differing standards of culture, temperament and racial habits which constitute in themselves basic possibilities for disharmony. In a democratic marriage this achieve-

ment of harmony is the result of effort; in other types of marriage, if it is attained at all, it is an achievement in which there is a strong element of compulsion.

In the same way the relationship of brothers to brothers, sisters to sisters, and brothers and sisters to one another is a triumph in social achievement, if it succeeds at all. Here is a world which cannot be described in terms of one part, nor even of two parts. There is a third element which is more than each and which all parts enter into together.

It is from this angle of families by conviction that one may best discuss the question of birth control, for in this type of family the rearing of children will be an adventure into which people will not enter by drift. Birth control of some kind is of very long standing in the human race. If one looks through the population census of India, one finds a larger percentage of males than of females. The census authorities have only one explanation — infanticide practiced by people who generally desire to rear more boys than girls. Control of the number of children in the Western world is a modern development. Birth control information can now be had from birth control clinics and many doctors. Although we must recognize that there is a physical and an ethical danger in the practice, this argument is nevertheless not final. Interference with the processes of nature by mechanical means has gone a long way in human society. There was once a time when men looked upon drought as a judgment of God upon his children; now they build irrigation ditches and

interfere with drought — and something happened to both theology and ethics when that first took place. Most of our modern progress has meant mechanical interference with the processes of nature.

Interference in sex matters has long been practiced. There was a time when it was considered dangerous for men and women to look upon each other. Purdah is a custom largely built upon that theory. Women, when they come out into the highways, are completely covered from head to foot by a long purdah robe. Only two small slits before their eyes make it possible for them to see where they are going. Houses are built in such a manner that women cannot look out into the street, nor can anyone from the street look within. Upon the top of the houses is a belt of flat roof where women can get sunshine and some exercise, but even this is surrounded by latticework. Purdah worked splendidly for the seclusion of women until the advent of the airplane. It is hard to estimate what the airplane will do to the roof gardens of India.

Based on the fear that the feasting of the eyes will lead to some kind of social perversion, the purdah robes are mechanical interferences with nature. The majority of people in the world now have given up the purdah system. We are perfectly willing that boys and girls should look upon one another, and we permit it without fear.

Birth control, however, is a different type of intervention. The purdah system and similar social devices were formed in the interest of discouraging and

limiting sex gratification. Birth control, in addition to the very legitimate purpose of preventing too many children, has the express purpose of increasing pleasure in sex matters. It is here that, for many people, it will probably be an invitation to exhaust life in an expression which has possibilities of bringing on deterioration. Count Keyserling calls attention to the fact that those countries which have achieved the highest in art and religion have also been those which have accepted a rather high degree of discipline in matters of sex expression. His contention seems valid.

There is still another perplexing problem we meet in the question of birth control. As we have already mentioned, the birth rate in most of our cities falls from 25 to 30 per cent short of being sufficient to replace the population. Birth control may involve the limitation of families to such an extent that people of ability and intelligence will cease to bear their share of the burden of perpetuating the race.

It is from the angle of families by conviction that we may discuss the matter of divorce. Divorce has frequently been assumed a violation of social law or of divine fiat. I think it is necessary to lay less emphasis upon this assumption and more upon the idea of conviction. Families represent one of the great basic agreements of society. Accordingly, if society is not stable in this realm it will become chaotic throughout. Dr. R. C. Cabot, in his *Meaning of Right and Wrong*, said that every agreement which is a good agreement carries with it a principle of revolt. I suppose he means that

the right to agree carries with it the right to disagree. The feeling that people cannot revolt, must not revolt, robs the fact that they do not revolt of its ethical quality.

The areas of family disorganization are not those in which people are accustomed to make great decisions. They are rather those in which people live trivial rather than great lives. In Chicago, for instance, the areas of highest divorce rate are those where people are failing to keep up their relationship to a vast number of organizations. They are areas where the churches, neighborhoods and even business are disintegrating.

In a recent study of 466 cases of divorce, the legal causes for separation were reported as 95 for adultery, 139 for cruelty and 231 for desertion. Other causes were financial tension, venereal infection, drinking and irregular habits. All of these represent, to a large degree, personal failure. The mounting number of divorces in the United States does not reflect so much a desire to carry through on a high plane the democratic principle, as a greater inadequacy on the part of people to meet accumulated crises.

What would be an ethical attitude toward divorce?

There was a time when the only cause recognized as valid for divorce was adultery — an attitude based on a very inadequate analysis of what constitutes a successful family. Are we to assume that all who do not commit adultery are therefore adequately meeting the laws of good family living? As a matter of fact, I have known of a number of cases of adultery in which the

individuals involved gained from the experience a new insight into family life. A number of years ago, among my church members were a young man and his wife, both working on salaries. They hoped that by foregoing the rearing of children and by working they could gather together enough money to buy a small business. The young man, however, was temporarily swept off his feet by another woman associated with him in the same business, and went off with her. His wife came to me for advice. She said her friends were urging her to get a divorce. I did not think that she should. In about three weeks her husband returned, a very penitent individual. He and his wife both carefully re-examined the question of the purpose of marriage and have since led a satisfactory, happy life together.

In some cases divorce is necessary as a therapeutic measure. Incompatible members of a family may, through constant disagreements, become involved in serious mental maladjustments. Again, divorce may save the moral standards of a family. A number of years ago I knew a woman who was carrying the financial burden of a family of four children and a husband who was a parasitic member of the family. Often he stole the money which his wife had accumulated to pay for the children's education in order to satisfy his craving for drugs. Finally the woman went to the divorce court, although it seemed to her a terrible thing to do. But I am satisfied that she saved the moral standards of her family by so doing.

Divorce, I have said, is the principle of revolt in family life and, like the principle of revolution in the state, it should be exercised in loyalty to the family. When people seek a divorce it should be in the interests of greater loyalty to the family institutions and the family idea, not in the interests of satisfying unbridled desires or injured tempers.

The statement, "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," is interpreted by many as a perpetual and solemn injunction against all severing of the family tie. But let us examine it. If God's will is merely the principle of custom-bound tradition, then the statement means one thing. If, however, God's will is a living will which seeks the highest good, then it is not reflected in the continuation of a union from which all true meaning has fled. And this seems to me the true interpretation of this question of the right to divorce. That right ought to be exercised only in the interest of that living will of God which could only be thwarted through the continuation of a union which has lost its meaning and become something evil.

A successful family life is also an achievement between parent and child. Where marriage is a creating of harmony out of diversity, education is a creating of independence out of dependence. The helpless infant must become the self-governing man. How dependent the child is we are today just beginning to learn. From his parents he takes over not merely physical structure but also a mental structure organized around primary loyalties. The father, the mother, the early

guide stand to the small child, in a way and to a degree which is never repeated in the course of his development, for that in the universe upon which he is dependent for support and affection. The impress of their influence therefore goes with him throughout his life and implants in him ideals and standards from which there is no escape except through growth into a larger loyalty and a more comprehensive understanding.

It may be said that the entire social structure, internalized in the form of conscience, is built upon a principle which forbids the disregard or evasion of a primary loyalty but which does permit that primary loyalty to be incorporated into one more comprehensive. To bring about this incorporation and to enable the growing individual to transcend the loyalties and standards represented by his early training, is, then, the task of education. In the carrying out of that task there are, of course, many difficulties and dangers, and it is seldom perfectly achieved. The parents may be over-indulgent and the child in consequence may grow up to be dependent or undisciplined. They may be over-severe, relying upon fear to secure obedience. In that case one of two things is likely to result. The conscience may grow harsh and rigid, causing the individual to become a prey to all sorts of fears and conflicts, or else to resort to protective devices and subterfuges in order to live at peace with the tyrant within. On the other hand, he may rebel and choose the career of a delinquent. He may shift his loyalties and seek

social validation in a group of his own kind. But no individual is likely to remain satisfied with a loyalty which is for him a lesser one, and the protective devices and subterfuges which block growth are seldom effective. Inner unrest and social maladjustment invariably result.

It is imperative that each individual's development from small to great loyalties take a social form. Several years ago, on a trip into the northwest, I undertook to discover the rootage of the farmer-labor radicalism in that section of the country. In response to an inquiry, I was directed to the home of William Bosch, who lived on a farm near Atwater, Minnesota. There I found a man and his wife, both over ninety years of age. They had seven sons and seven daughters, who were married and living on adjoining farms. With their various connections they constituted an aggregation of about seventy people. Two of the sons were active in political work and the rest formed a friendly nucleus of supporters. They even maintained a religious fellowship made up largely of their own family group and friendly neighbors who wished to meet with them.

The story goes that in the early 'eighties, William Bosch was a member of a group of about three hundred Dutchmen who settled in a colony in southern Minnesota. Most of them became conservative Republicans, but not William Bosch. He had read John Ruskin and radical literature. When Populism swept the state he alone of all the colony became an ardent

believer in the doctrine and he challenged to debate men of other political faith. One day, hearing that about two hundred of his fellow Dutchmen were hanging William Jennings Bryan in effigy from the limb of a tree, he grabbed his shotgun and started down the road. His neighbors fled at his coming, but though he was victorious in this incident the other members of the colony took up a collection to buy out his land holdings and turn his farm over to a less radical member. Taking his money, William Bosch moved with his family to new land in central Minnesota. Every wave of political radicalism which swept Minnesota found him a willing listener. In his own words: "In my youth (in Holland) I was fed Calvinism with a spoon. I still believe it is good Calvinism to cause trouble for the political state. My wife and I have been running something of a political incubator. Around our table we have discussed every political question which is vital to the interests of the American farmer."

When I use the term "socializing the American family," I have in mind the relating of the American family to the interests of society not through super-directed manipulation but by self-directed interest. The democratic family is not necessarily public-minded; but its architecture symbolizes the fact that it is a candidate for public-mindedness. The single house looking out upon the street symbolizes a commitment to public interest, even if it is not always achieved. It is true that there are too many homes which never make the transi-

tion from a petty interest in their own private affairs to an interest in the public.

The Oriental bride and groom to some extent lose any tendency to self-interest because they are members of a larger family and have a larger loyalty outside of themselves. The social-minded self-discipline and regimentation of the larger family make it understood to the married couple that they cannot live for their own satisfaction. The president of the University of Amoy once told me of the larger family group of which he was proud to be a member—a group which could trace its history to the time of Confucius and which had many honorable connections with several ruling dynasties. The elders of this family, he said, could take over the problems of law and order, perform the functions of a law court and secure law enforcement with no dependence at all upon the state. Here was a certain public-mindedness within the family group. The democratic family, however, has turned over most of these functions to the community, civic organizations and the state. However, there is nothing compulsory about this relationship. If the American family pleases it can be more selfish and less cognizant of its social responsibilities than any other family in existence. In fact, I think it would not be unfair to say that many of our families are the most selfish in the world.

Isolation is especially true of families which live the anonymous life of the modern city. They have no consciousness of neighborhood; civic responsibility has been abrogated; politics has become so corrupt that

they think it futile to participate in it; they are isolated from both voluntary and public institutional life. If they were living in the country or in a small town, the neighborhood would be real to them and neighborhood responsibility would be understood. As it is, isolation and petty-mindedness lay hold of them like a disease. Even in the training of children there is an absence of those home chores which could be the beginning of public-mindedness on the part of the boy on the farm.

Dr. Henry Churchill King, in his *Laws of Friendship*, tells of the way families coddle themselves into selfishness. He quotes from another author as follows:

The higher moral good of the husband occupies most wives comparatively little; and often a man who starts with a great many lofty and disinterested aspirations deteriorates, year by year, in a deplorable manner under the influence of a sufficiently well-meaning and personally conscientious wife. If you ask how can this be, the answer is that the wife's affection being of a poor and short-sighted kind, she constantly urges her husband to think of himself and his own interests rather than of the persons and objects for which he was ready to sacrifice himself. "Do not go on that charitable errand today: you have caught a cold. It will answer as well tomorrow." "Do not invite that dull old friend." "Do not join that tiresome committee." "Pray take a long holiday." "By all means, buy yourself a new hunter." "Do not refrain from

confessing your unorthodox opinions." This kind of thing, dropped every day like the lump of sugar into the breakfast cup of tea, in the end produces a real constitutional change in the man's mind. He begins to think himself, first, somewhat of a hero when he goes against such sweet counsel, and then a Quixote, and then a fool. And a curious reciprocity is also established. The husband cannot do less than return the wife's kindness by begging her not to distress and tire herself by performing any duty which costs a little self-sacrifice; and she again returns the compliment, and so on and so on, till they nurse each other into complete selfishness. . . . But if, on the other hand, the wife from the first cherishes every spark of generous feeling or noble and disinterested ambition in her husband, and he, in his turn, encourages her in every womanly charity and good deed, how they will act and react on each other month after month and year after year, each growing nobler, and loving more nobly, and being more worthy to be loved, till their sacred and blessed union brings them together to the very gates of heaven! That is what marriage ought to be, what it is to a few choice and most happy couples and what it ought to be to all. (p. 24)

I doubt if we have ever estimated the aptitude and the opportunity of the family to develop public-minded citizens by discussion of public questions in fireside and

table groups. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, founder of Robert College, grew up on a farm in Maine. In his book, *My Life and Times*, he gives a picture of the family fire-side that is a vivid description of the real training school which developed the world-minded founder of Robert College:

Our family was a reading family. On winter evenings one of us always read aloud, while some of the family industries as sewing and knitting were going on. There is a bright glow of social happiness over those evenings as they recur to me in memory. To my brother and myself the family training of reading and discussion was of more value than the common school. Our mother and sisters were authorities that we never questioned. Two or three of Scott's novels were read, *Quentin Durward* the first; but our reading was mainly historical and biographical. The Bible was read before retiring to rest, and each child had a system of reading the Bible through, one chapter every day and five every Sunday. Our Sundays were sacredly guarded from all unnecessary labor, and the reading was in harmony with the sacredness of the day. The *Panoplist*, and afterward its successor, *The Missionary Herald*, was read aloud, and especially every item of missionary news, for some of our neighbors did not believe in missions. The missions were then so few that a close ac-

quaintance with them was easily cultivated, and we believed in them with all our might.

The pathetic fact about the picture portrayed for us in Cyrus Hamlin's boyhood home is that, to an altogether too large extent, it has disappeared from American life.

MAKING THE NATION SAFE FOR THE FAMILY

THE FAMILY rests on a foundation of sentiment. Far be it from me to advocate a return to the age of homespun; reconstruction of the pre-capitalistic period in America when the economic system did not penalize parenthood and when the rearing of families was integrated with certain great convictions, is possible only on paper. Nevertheless, it may be profitable to resurrect a picture of that age in order that we may discover certain sentiments which ought to be approximated in the reorganization of society. For this reason I have chosen that eloquent and accurate picture of the age of homespun created in the address of Horace Bushnell, from which I have already had occasion to quote:

. . . Here lie [in the country cemetery] the sturdy kings of homespun, who climbed among these hills, with their axes, to cut away room for their cabins and for family prayers, and so for the good future to come. Here lie their sons, who foddered their cattle on the snows, and built stone fences while the corn was sprouting in the hills,

getting ready, in that way, to send a boy or two to college. Here lie . . . the good housewives that made coats, every year, like Hannah, for their children's bodies, and lined their memory with catechism. Here the millers, that took honest toll of the rye; the smiths and coopers, that superintended two hands and got a little revenue of honest bread and schooling from their small joint stock of two-handed investment. Here the district committees and school mistresses; the religious society founders and church deacons; and, withal, a great many sensible, wise-headed men, who read a weekly newspaper, loved George Washington and their country, and had never a thought of going to the General Assembly. These are the men and women that made Litchfield County. . . .

But most of all to be remembered, are those friendly circles, gathered so often around the winter's fire — not the stove, but the fire, the brightly blazing, hospitable fire. In the early dusk, the home circle is drawn more closely and quietly round it; but a good neighbor and his wife drop in shortly, from over the way, and the circle begins to spread. Next, a few young folk from the other end of the village, entering in brisker mood, find as many more chairs set in as wedges into the periphery to receive them also. And then a friendly sleigh full of old and young, that have come down from the hill to spend an hour or two, spread the circle again, moving it still farther back from the fire;

and the fire blazes just as much higher and more brightly, having a new stick added for every guest. There is no restraint, certainly no affectation of style. They tell stories, they laugh, they sing. They are serious and gay by turns, or the young folks go on with some play, while the fathers and mothers are discussing some hard point of theology in the minister's last sermon; or perhaps the great danger coming to sound morals from the multiplication of turnpikes and newspapers! Meantime, the good housewife brings out her choice stock of home-grown exotics, gathered from three realms — doughnuts from the pantry, hickory nuts from the chamber, and the nicest, smoothest apples from the cellar; all of which, including, I suppose I must add, the rather unpoetic beverage that gave its acid smack to the ancient hospitality, are discussed as freely, with no fear of consequences. And then, as the tall clock in the corner of the room ticks on majestically towards nine, the conversation takes, it may be, a little more serious turn, and it is suggested that a very happy evening may fitly be ended with a prayer. Whereupon the circle breaks up with a reverent, congratulative look on every face, which is itself the truest language of a social nature blessed in human fellowship. . . .

But the schools — we must not pass by these, if we are to form a truthful and sufficient picture of the homespun days. The schoolmaster did not exactly go round the district to fit out the children's

minds with learning, as the shoemaker often did to fit their feet with shoes . . . but, to come as near it as possible, he boarded round . . . and the wood for the common fire was supplied in a way equally primitive, viz: by a contribution of loads from the several families, according to their several quantities of childhood. The children were all clothed alike in homespun; and the only signs of aristocracy were that some were clean and some a degree less so, some in fine white and striped linen, some in brown tow crash; and . . . the good fathers of some testified the opinion that they had of their children by bringing fine round loads of hickory wood to warm them, while some others, I regret to say, brought only scanty, scraggy, ill-looking heaps of green oak, white birch and hemlock. . . .

Passing from the school to the church, or rather I should say, to the meeting-house . . . here, again, you meet the picture of a sturdy homespun worship. Probably it stands on some hill, midway between three or four valleys, whither the tribes go up to worship and, when the snowdrifts are deepest, go literally from strength to strength. There is no furnace or stove, save the footstoves that are filled from the fires of the neighboring houses, and brought in partly as a rather formal compliment to the delicacy of the tender sex, and sometimes because they are really wanted. The dress of the assembly is mostly homespun, indicating only slight distinctions of quality in the worshipers. They

are seated according to age, the old king Lemuels and their queens in front, near the pulpit, and the younger Lemuels farther back, enclosed in pews, sitting back to back, impounded, all, for deep thought and spiritual digestion; only the deacons, sitting close under the pulpit, by themselves, to receive, as their distinctive honor, the more perpendicular droppings of the word. Clean around the front of the gallery is drawn a single row of choir, headed by the key-pipe in the center. The pulpit is overhung by an august wooden canopy, called a sounding board. . . .

There is no affectation of seriousness in the assembly, no mannerism of worship; some would say too little of the manner of worship. They think of nothing, in fact, save what meets their intelligence and enters into them by that method. They appear like men who have a digestion for strong meat and have no conception that trifles more delicate can be of any account to feed the system. . . .

The very rehearsal of the characteristics of the pre-capitalistic age ought to convince us that any return to it is now impossible. But there are certain very evident relationships that characterized that period which perhaps can guide us in planning for a social order which will make the nation safe for the family.

The first notable characteristic of the age of home-spun was an interplay between the social and economic order and the family standard of values. If we break

open any one of these social orders, we find that deeper than the rule of law is control through conceptions of what is worthy of supreme devotion. In the age of homespun there was a certain coincidence between what families considered worth while and what the social order considered worth while. This relationship, too, must be grasped and firmly held in mind in any future reconstruction. The morale of the family cannot be maintained on the basis of the affection two people hold for each other. This seems to me the valid criticism which all other types of family economy register against the romantic marriage. The larger families of the Orient and the convention marriage family of Europe both insist that romantic love must be reinforced by such sentiments as patriotism and the willingness to sacrifice for a racial or class economy. When the great national passion comes to be the making of money and not the rearing of strong, adequate families, there comes a dualism in the national life which not only works to the disadvantage of the family but also to the corruption and perversion of the nation.

Secondly, in the age of homespun there was an interplay between valid standards of personal success and the social order. The road to heaven and the road to hell were evident to all eyes. The age of homespun was essentially a society in which people knew and were able to form a decent public opinion about one another. It was a society in which the virtues and vices inevitably worked out in a system of rewards and punishments. To realize how thoroughly we have departed from such

a condition, one needs only to read the sensational stories in the morning newspaper.

To state the issue more positively, we must restore the family to a place in the national scheme of values. Behind all laws and all social organization is that fire of human energy which is the organization of the national will around that which is most desired. Values are related to the past and are tremendously important in guiding the experience of the future.

Some men see a stream in terms of trout pools; others, engineers, would see it in terms of potential power; still others would see it as site for a factory. Now these separate judgments which root in the practical experience of men are the stuff out of which the national will is constructed. Some see the national life in terms of factories; some see it in terms of art; some, in terms of family life; and some in terms of national glory and national power. When these judgments are partial or warped, men act badly and nations act badly. When these judgments are adequate, men build civilization. We often use the phrase, "a change of the national heart." By that I think we mean a change in the relative standing which these values have for the people. If the family seems most important or if business seems most important, we have a conflict of values between family and business. And a change in the national heart would be a shift in the relative importance of these two great objectives. If the family is to be safe in the nation it must be a value which men instinctively seek and instinctively reach out to protect. Unless we

deal with the family and its relation to the nation in this stage, we cannot possibly deal with it in a later stage.

We have said that the family rests on a foundation of sentiment. The family also rests on a social structure — a structure made up of custom, law, property ownership, economic behavior and population distribution. Unless there is a mutual reinforcement of family and social structure, there will be conflict eventuating in the disorganization of both. Many books could be written on the relation of the family to the national body of custom; one such book is the *Social History of the American Family* by Calhoun. Other books could be written on the relation of the family to law; such a book is *The Family and the State* by Breckenridge. Other books could be written on the family and the housing situation.

Similarly, the relation of the family to the economic system deserves far more adequate treatment than it can have in this chapter. It must be sufficient to point out that the family must rest on something more than a foundation of sentiment; it must be incorporated into the national social structure.

The American democratic family has not had a body of law providing equal rights for husband and wife. The background of American law is British common law, which is still closely related to the patriarchal ideas of feudalism. In the records of the British courts there is much debate as to how responsible a man is for the behavior of his wife. It was generally under-

stood that a man was responsible for the misdeeds of his wife, and since he was to be held for her misconduct there was a natural assumption that he had the right to punish her. This raised the further question as to how much he should punish her. Had he the right to beat his wife with a stick "no thicker than his thumb"? Or should he give her moderate correction? "For, as he is to answer for her misbehavior the law thought it reasonable to trust him with this power of restraining her by domestic chastisement in the same manner a man is allowed to correct his apprentices or his children." This was characterized as the "pet monkey" theory. Manifestly, such a dependent creature could not inherit property nor participate in public affairs. The story of woman's change of status before the law is a long one. It is a gradual achievement accompanied by courageous self-sacrifice on the part of self-respecting women who, for the sake of public good, have initiated and led protest after protest.

Similar fights have been necessary for the protection of children from exploitation by economic agencies which have found child labor profitable. Alexander Hamilton, the ardent advocate of a privileged status for the national industries, sought in factory production a great opportunity for employing the labor of women and children:

In consequence of it [the cotton mill], all the different processes of spinning cotton are performed by means of machines, which are put in

motion by water and attended chiefly by women and children; and by a smaller number of persons, in the whole, than are requisite in the ordinary mode of spinning. And it is an advantage of great moment that the operations of this mill may continue with convenience during the night as well as during the day. . . .

This is not least valuable of the means by which manufacturing institutions contribute to augment the general stock of industry and production. In places where those institutions prevail, besides the persons regularly engaged in them, they afford occasional and extra employment to industrious individuals and to families, who are willing to devote the leisure resulting from the intermissions of their ordinary pursuits to collateral labors, as a resource for multiplying their acquisitions or their enjoyments. The husbandman himself experiences a new source of profit and support from the increased industry of his wife and daughters, invited and stimulated by the demands of the neighboring manufactories.

Besides this advantage of occasional employment to classes having different occupations, there is another, of a nature allied to it, and of a similar tendency. This is the employment of persons who would otherwise be idle, and in many cases a burthen on the community, either from the bias of temper, habit, infirmity of body or some other cause, indisposing or disqualifying them from the

toils of the country. It is worthy of particular remark that, in general, women and children are rendered more useful, and the latter more early useful, by manufacturing establishments than they would otherwise be. Of the number of persons employed in the cotton manufactories of Great Britain, it is computed that four-sevenths nearly are women and children; of whom the greater proportion are children and many of them of a tender age. (*Works of Alexander Hamilton*, vol. 3, p. 207)

The tempering of this enthusiasm for the work of women and children in the factories has been a one hundred year task for social workers in America.

It is not sufficient, however, to seek to alleviate the working conditions of women and children in modern industry. A more thoroughgoing effort must be made to raise the family in the national economic process. It has often been assumed that the economic process, working in an unhindered or free manner, resolves into the good of all and consequently of the family. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The genius of industry is not the protection of family values, but the production of economic goods. Nor does the distribution of these economic goods by the national industrial process take account of the needs of the process by which the race is reproduced and the cultural values of the family maintained.

XII

WHEN THE FAMILY MUST FIGHT FOR ITS RIGHTS

THERE ARE times when the family must fight for its rights.

For three hundred years the family has been seeking its autonomy as over against the church. It is closely related to religion but the church has often tyrannized over it. The story of that fight is a long and interesting one. It probably has not yet been won by the family but enough progress has been made to guarantee its ultimate victory. But there is evidence that the family has a new fight on its hands. The state has increasingly entered the realm once occupied by the family. The social worker and the doctor in the name of the state enter the home and assume an authority once held only by the father and mother. The Dionne quintuplets, for example, have only partially belonged to the mother who gave them birth ever since they startled the world by their arrival. It is not yet clear how far the state will go in the invasion of the family circle. In other countries this invasion has progressed further than it has in the United States.

If one should draw a line through Europe so that on the west side are Denmark and the Scandinavian coun-

tries, then let the line come down along the west side of Germany and strike the Mediterranean Sea somewhere near Marseilles — on the west side of the line will be those countries which are having experience with some kind of democratic collectivism, while on the east side will be found those which are experimenting with the totalitarian state. On the east, the state increasingly claims the right to take charge of the family. It organizes the youth in its own youth groups which it trains for the state. It feels free to order an increase or decrease in the birth rate. Children are to be bred for the state. In at least two of these countries those who are leading toward a new social order have taken their symbols of national greatness from the state. They have used force in bringing about social change. The family here exists for a totalitarian national economy in much the same way that the family in Oriental countries exists for a totalitarian racial economy.

The following quotation is from *Under the Swastika*, by J. B. Holt (University of North Carolina Press, 1936):

The building up of the Hitler Youth organization has taken place, of course, at the expense of all other youth organizations. The attempt has been made to “absorb” the groups whose breaking up would obviously have led to conflicts with the churches. In this way 400,000 Catholic and 700,000 Protestant youth were made members of the Hitler Youth by decree and given “duty” as

Hitler Youth. Boy Scouts, Young Steel Helmets, political party youth organizations, and all sectarian and nonsectarian sporting clubs, have been appropriated by the Hitler Youth, some of them losing their identity completely.

Aside from the religious question, the family circle is endangered, though an agreement was made on the first of August of this year that Saturday should be National Youth Day. Sunday should be left for the family circle. The schools were to have the remaining weekdays. Hitler Youth were to be freed from sport and gymnastics in connection with the schools after school hours, and for them there was to be no Saturday school. Those not in the Hitler Youth would continue to go to school on Saturdays as customary in Germany. This is a settlement of a situation as uncomfortable for the youth as for the family, government and churches.

A German correspondent to the *Spectator* (June 29, 1934) pictured aptly the relentless and determined character of the struggle over the youth's free time and a share in its bringing up. After school, sports, Hitler Youth duty, prescribed weekend trips, on Sunday or on afternoons also, and after school, theater or comparable extra-curricular activities are deducted from a boy's waking hours, the family and the church are left very little of the boy's time. Hitler Youth maintain that, while they should regard the parents and church as hav-

ing equal rights with the Hitler Youth, the parents are not capable of bringing up young Germans in truly National Socialistic spirit. And neither the Catholic nor the Protestant church is regarded by the Hitler Youth as mature enough in "new thinking" to train National Socialists. The youth regard many parents as still liberalistic or "even" Marxistic.

As far as the effect of National Socialist organization of the German people is concerned, one man remarked that he was already "organized" eight times in the Nazi attempt to reduce the multiple duplicating organization of pre-Nazi days. And in one family, all of whose members belonged to Nazi organizations, the only day on which the family came together was at the National Socialist Party Day once a year in Nuremberg. The agreement of August first is an attempt to protect the family life, which, in spite of the effects of such organizations, is one of the recognized aims of Hitler, in contrast to the communist philosophy. Whether or not conflicting desires cause the opposite results is an open question.

The state is man in his governing capacity, representing him in his exercise of power. It is concerned with law and policing. Idealism in the state is always expressed in terms of justice. Men hold a different relationship to one another as citizens from that which they hold as members of a family.

If the genius of the state is imposed on the more delicate relationships of life which are found in the family and in religion, violence is done to both. The family does not exist to breed people for the state.

It should be possible for us to work out a democratic collectivism which would allow each function in society to make its contribution to the whole in something of a fellowship of functions. When the state takes over the function of the family, the final question will be whether or not something has been sacrificed when the child learns his philosophy of life first from officers of the state rather than from the tenderness of parenthood. It is a serious question whether the ethics of love would disappear from society altogether were they not first experienced inside the family.

Orthodox socialism has a legitimate case against the family.

Although the family has a defensible history as the organizer and holder of property rights in a primitive society and although there was a legitimate alliance between the family and the homestead in pioneer days, the family as the agent for the holding and transfer of property by inheritance is an anachronism which modern society cannot long endure. The mere fact of someone's inheriting, by the accident of birth, one hundred million dollars is no guarantee of successful stewardship of the estate. This is an imposition of the genius of the family upon the economic order which will probably not survive the critical thinking of this generation.

But on the other hand the family has a case against

the orthodox socialist. The strict doctrine of economic determinism is in conflict with the claims of biological determinism. The family has been modified by economic conditions but it has remained true to a genius of its own; it is still a family. A tree may, for a thousand years, stand by the side of the road and bear in its body the record of all the droughts, the energies of the soil and the disfigurements of passing civilizations, but it is still a tree. Likewise the family has stood by the side of the human road since the dawn of history; it bears in its structure the marks of the nomadic, the agricultural, the machine age, and it will reflect whatever economic structure is ahead of us, but it has, and it is safe to assume that it will have, a genius all its own. It has survived many economic orders and it will survive many more. It has more justification to talk about the transitory nature of the economic order than the economic minded have to talk about the passing of the family.

Again, when one reads the apologists for the family in the modern socialist state he is impressed with the fact that they do not know what to do with it. The Webbs write a two-volume history of Soviet Russia and do not mention the family to the extent that the word gets into the index. When we read the treatment of the family by other writers on Soviet Russia we are impressed that the story they tell is the story of the freeing of the family from the church and the freeing of the members of the family from one another — a record which has been going on in capitalistic democracy

for a century. Summing up their story they tell us of a period of reckless freedom following the revolution and a final settling down for some unmentioned reason to a present belief in monogamy. In other words, socialism seems not to have carried the family as far as democracy has; it has made an attempt to free the family from the church but because of its doctrine of economic determinism it has given the family no firm ground on which to stand. It has helped free woman from the tyranny of man and children from the tyranny of the parents, but has not so far given us what socialism ought to give us — a true doctrine of human association inside the family and a theory of the integration of the family with the other free institutions of society.

There is a third very practical difficulty which the socialists will have to face. It is a difficulty which can be, but has not been, overcome. Historically, socialism as a movement arose among the urban proletariat and all too much has been a movement by and for the urban proletariat. Its program for the rural classes has often been shortsighted in the extreme. So far neither in Soviet Russia nor in the capitalistic countries have the urban birth rates been sufficient to supply a population. Before the family is safe in the hands of the urban proletariat the socialist will have to do a better job of thinking for those populations which are the population seedbeds of the nation. That this will be done by any urban proletariat dictatorships is not likely.

PART FOUR

THE CHURCH AND THE FAMILY

XIII

WHEN PEOPLE MEET CRISES

HERETOFORE I have taken no account of a factor in marriage that I am sure the reader has thought of — how different kinds of people meet the crises of family life. There is a personal disintegration which destroys family life, and a personal integration which lifts family life to a higher plane. There are institutions in the community which promote mental health, and there are those which tend to influence the individual toward mental disease. If we can help people meet their crises more adequately, fewer homes will break under strain, and if we know how to organize the resources of mental health and make them more available to people, we can lift not only the individuals but families to the highroad of success.

Every vocation has its own type of crisis, its own variety of strain. The family is no exception. Some time ago I asked a doctor to tell me of the strains he encountered in his vocation. He said there was first of all the long preparation — four years of college, three of medical college, an internship, and then the long wait for patients. Then there was the strain of taking responsibility for people in their great decisions, the

strain on a man's sympathy as he sees people undergo suffering. After a doctor has built up his practice, he endures the strain of seeing better and younger men taking his patients away from him. Finally, the doctor's time is never his own, so that he never knows when he will have to leave his family appointments to look after the health of other people.

I had a similar talk with a prominent newspaper man. He mentioned the strain of having to meet the deadlines of the many editions of the contemporary newspaper; the strain of conflict in having his pride injured when he received a smaller assignment than he thought he was entitled to; the constant temptation to be cynical about all of life because he saw so much of the folly and tragedy in it.

Family life, which we might think of as a haven from such strains as these, has its own, even severer ones. There is, first of all, the strain between men and women. Men and women are often entirely unacquainted with one another's habits. Sometimes the man was reared on the farm and the woman in the city. They have different ways of life, and each must adjust to the other. With the birth of the first child, entirely new feelings are released and husband and wife must make a new series of adjustments. After the family begins to grow up parents have a sense of confidence, but when children enter the public school further problems arise. The parents must see, first, that the children learn the lesson of association with others; and second, that school discipline is just and teacher guid-

ance friendly and wise. When the children, now young men and women, go to college, the parents face the problem of growing mentally with them and adjusting to their new social life. And finally, there is the great social and psychological adjustment that must be made to the young man's or woman's marriage. In short, family life is a perpetual source of strain, and those who do not understand this fact fail to understand that which makes family life both exciting and exacting.

People meet these strains in various ways according to their differing capacities. Here are the stories of two young men whom I have known. They represent diametrically opposite ways of triumphing over the hazards of life. The first, when a student in a school in Utah, went to the mountains during his summer vacation to earn money to carry on his schooling. One day in an accidental explosion of dynamite, he lost both hands and was permanently blinded. Certainly his handicaps from that time on were real and everything pointed in the direction of a life of complete dependency. After the first terrible suffering endured during his hospitalization, he faced a struggle with his own family who were insisting that he take a place of dependency within the family, and possibly beg on the streets for a living. He left home saying he would not return until he was independent. For a time he became a drug addict, but later shut himself up in a hospital and, with the aid of a physician, made a successful fight against the habit.

Before this, however, he had gone to a school in Pittsburgh where a professor with insight and understanding undertook to train him in the reading of classic literature, with the idea that he could earn his living on the lecture platform as a reader. Now he determined to utilize that training. He memorized great passages from classical literature and successfully started a career as a literary interpreter. There came, however, invitations to tell his life's story, and interpretation of the struggle which he had made against difficulties proved so fascinating to the public that he went up and down the country telling the story of his triumph. Never has he been as necessary to the American public as during this depression. He often lectures at Harvard. He has lectured at the University of Chicago. He has been back and forth across the United States alone some thirty times. Not long ago we had a card from him postmarked Hawaii, and then another from the Panama Canal.

This story is given to make concrete one way in which people meet crises. I have worked out an analysis of this road in terms of attitudes, personal results and social results. It starts, it seems to me, with a set of fairly definite attitudes. When the crisis occurs, the individual meets it with faith, humility, intellectual alertness and constant will for good. As a result, he develops a sense of self-worth; gradually he gathers together his personal forces; he increases practice of useful skills and habits. Social results accompany self-development. The individual finds himself a member

of some group with high standards. He develops a morale for the improvement of his own standards. He finds himself supported by the good will of other people and a growing group around him. In addition, he eliminates waste of energy and ability due to hate, rivalry and such baser passions, and finds himself with a feeling that he is living a life which has something of a universal meaning. Others want to hear his story. He is living not for himself; he is living for others. He becomes a member of a surviving group and lives with that group. This is what I call the road to personal and social salvation. It involves the triumph of character over difficulties.

On the other hand, I have in mind a young Jewish man who underwent progressive deterioration. The loss of his job brought a sense of crisis in his life which he could not bring himself to meet. He visited astrologers, spiritualists and clairvoyants for light on his future. He did not want to face the future; he wanted to know about it. He was anxious to solve the problem of the future through foreknowledge, not through courage and adventure. As is generally the case, their advice simply added to the confusion of his inner life. From some of their hints he decided that his wife was unfaithful to him and he began to blame her and to center his suspicions on an acquaintance. Along with this chaotic attempt to evade a crisis there came, of course, an increasing tendency toward emotional explosion, a loss of his skill and a general lack of personal responsibility. He lost standing with possible employ-

ers, and from being unemployed he became unemployable. The process gained momentum until he became so mentally disturbed that it was found necessary to send him to an institution.

Here is an example of the worst way of meeting a crisis. The steps in this process of deterioration, it seems to me, are as definite as the steps in the process of personal integration which I previously described. When this young man reached a crisis in his life he met it with evasion and compromise, bluffing, shifting responsibility. He took refuge in delusion, cynicism, bitterness, hate and suspicion, all of which worked itself out in a set of personal results. He became more and more given to emotional explosions, to lack of control. He sought to hide from life by taking refuge with those who claim to deal with life in "occult" terms. His surrender entailed loss of skill and intellectual ability. He was not a person associated with others in a collective approach to life; when he joined with others, it was in a cult of self-defense or in an organized effort to win at the expense of others. He took refuge in hearsay and false reports which brought temporary comfort to his soul. His loss of skill and of knowledge increased progressively. He lost all capacity to work with other people. And so the end was a hospital. This I call the lower road. I think one might even call it the road to hell — a modern definition of hell, even as the other road was to a modern conception of heaven.

SOCIETIES OF INTERPRETATION

THERE ARE certain institutions in a community which have as their purpose interpretation, relaxation, mutual sharing and recuperation. They are not like grocery stores or schoolhouses or courthouses, or any of the so-called "useful" institutions. Many of them are places to which men retire in their leisure. This does not mean that they are unnecessary institutions. The unanimity with which men seek them proves that they are vitally necessary. They are institutions in which men and women achieve status, get recognition, or are reassured in their purposes. A sketch from *Batter Cake Flats*, an unpublished manuscript, illustrates in terms of two simple individuals the necessary part which such institutions may play in the life of a family:

Johnnie Williams and his wife, Mary, are somewhat like our old friends, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Spratt. Johnnie is short of stature and weighs between 180 and 200 pounds, while Mary is about six feet in height and tips the scales at 125.

When the teacher first knew these two they were living in a tent in a section of the city that lies be-

tween the river and the packing houses called Batter Cake Flats. As far as education was concerned neither boasted of a very complete knowledge of the three R's. The religious background on the early record is put down as Catholic, but their standing with the denomination would be rated as very low. Their social status, on the other hand, would be rated as very high in their own community.

Johnnie at this time was a horse trader and gambler by profession. His winnings were often quite large but the men said that he "played square." He never "cheated a friend." He was always ready to help a "fellow who was out of luck," that is to say, had come into legal entanglements. He was often called upon to sit up with the sick and could always be counted upon to contribute his share for funeral expenses whenever there was a death among the campers. He was a man of few words but those few words were usually the determining ones in case of a dispute in the crowd. Johnnie was considered a good provider. His camp outfit was the best in the neighborhood. He was devoted to his wife and kind to her when he was sober. Every other Saturday was traders' day when he took his horses to the city square; every other Saturday morning he came home "fightin' drunk" and his wife and friends gave him plenty of room.

Mary was a regular attendant at the little mission

and took an active part in all its activities. She became a loyal friend of one of the workers who was the teacher of the Worth-while Class, a young woman's Bible class in the "big church up town." Mary visited the class one Sunday and was surprised to find "the girls weren't stuck up a bit." They welcomed her most cordially. Almost before they realized it Mary was taking her place in the class and had become a very important link between the big church and the mission in the flats. The friendship of the members of this class did much to change Mary's outlook upon life and helped her over many a hard place. While to the young women themselves the term social service began to take on a new and richer meaning.

One day the teacher visited Mary and found her very much excited. "Didn't you read about Johnnie in the society column of the morning *Journal*? Well, he and Bud Avery had a terrible fight and cut each other up plumb awful. Bud, he's in the hospital and Johnnie's out on bail. I done taken him to the priest and made him promise not to drink another drop till Easter."

But alas for promises, long before Easter, early one Sunday morning the teacher was awakened by a prolonged ringing of the front door bell. There was Mary, clothes torn, hair disheveled, glasses askew — the trouble? In spite of her warning that no drinking or gambling should go on around "her place" Johnnie had brought in a

number of the old gang the night before and the party was lasting into the early morning hours. Finally Mary could stand it no longer. She knocked over their table, scattered their cards and money and dashed the bottles of whiskey against the wagon wheels. The men departed in haste. Johnnie, half drunk, had attempted to administer punishment and Mary had come to the only place of refuge she knew. The next day, in spite of Johnnie's pleadings and promises, Mary filed suit for divorce, packed up her few belongings, rented a room and went to work in a cotton mill.

With the closing of the saloons Johnnie's opportunity for the fortnightly spree was cut off. A trial of bootlegger's whiskey sent him to the hospital. He was so frightened by this experience that no amount of persuasion could induce him to try it again. After two years of "decent living" and hard work, Mary took Johnnie back. There were three conditions: no more gambling, no more drink and no tent but a house like the Worthwhile girls have. "Don't none of them live in tents."

After a long absence the teacher was again in the city and visited her old friends. She found Johnnie the owner of a small store where he was doing a fair business in harness and second-hand furniture. Mary was at home busy with her household duties. Besides the cottage, which was entirely paid for, they owned a fine Jersey cow.

Mary sold milk to the neighbors and gave away much where it was needed. At Christmas time it has become their custom to put up a big Christmas tree in the front room. Here the Worth-while girls give a party for a group of little children in whom the class has been interested, many of them youngsters whom Mrs. Williams has been instrumental in bringing to the "big Sunday school." "You see they learn so much more up there just gettin' to know nice folks." Mr. Williams makes a wonderful Santa Claus. The short, stout, jolly old gentleman couldn't be better impersonated.

When the teacher's visit was over and she was ready to leave the city Johnnie and Mary were at the station to say good-by. Johnnie confided the information that he always had a little money laid by in the bank to take care of Mary in case anything should happen to him. Mary said that she thought Johnnie would be joining the church pretty soon. He always was a "plumb good man." He just couldn't leave whiskey alone.

In this history the saloon, the club and the church all appear as institutions to which people retire in times of need for some kind of help. In our last chapter I referred to the Jewish boy who followed a course leading to increasing spiritual chaos, aided and abetted by the institutions in which he sought help. It is a story of a pilgrimage among astrologers and spiritualists and clairvoyants. Fortunately, the social worker on

the case gives the picture of a type of institution by reporting his conversation with an astrologer to whom the young man went. This astrologer was apparently the person who started him off in pursuit of his pot of gold. She was the first of a long list of mediums whom he had visited and it was through her that he had first become interested in the occult. The young man went to her often because she temporarily eased his mind. He described her as the world's greatest astrologer. She herself, however, was more modest; she only claimed to be the foremost American astrologer. According to her business card, she was prepared by scientific study of the stars to give counsel in all the affairs of life. For private interviews she charged women five dollars and men ten dollars. Business forecasts, with dates of events and typewritten horoscopes, were fifteen dollars. Her apartment was attractive, well furnished. The astrologer was perhaps fifty years old, a woman of education and culture. She claimed to have several college degrees. When asked regarding the patient, she at first denied all acquaintance with him but finally succeeded in remembering him. "What is the theory of astrology?" the social worker asked. The answer:

If you know the exact day and hour and moment when a child is born you can then, by determining the position of the planets, forecast the influences which dominate that child's life. This follows with the doctrine of correspondence, the planets

representing the organs of the Grand Man of God, and the child at his birth being an expression of the Grand Man at that time. It is mathematics — advanced mathematics. However, it is necessary to take into account not merely the charts of the heavens, but also the status of the family. I recently made a horoscope for Mayor C's baby and another for the baby of a physician, a friend of the Mayor, both babies being born within twenty minutes of each other. While the chart of the heavens would therefore be the same for the two, the forecast would differ because the physician's status would remain constant while C is likely to become senator and go up and up. It is possible not merely to make horoscopes for human beings. I have myself only recently made the horoscope of a cat. . . . It is only when we proceed blindly that certain things result. The wise man rules his stars.

I am especially interested in the medical aspects of astrology. The *Twelve Tissue Builders of Schuessler*, published in 1914, is a work in which I place special reliance.

She offered to give a horoscope for the investigator, but as he did not know the exact hour and moment of birth this was impossible. However, he gave his birthday and the year of birth and said, "Suppose it were one o'clock in the morning?" The results were highly favorable. By great good luck he hit upon the most

auspicious hour in the day for being ushered into the world. Her forecast for this poor old world was much less favorable.

This is the end of an age. Two thousand years ago a new sun had arisen in Pisces, the Fishes, or in the Twelfth sign in the Zodiac and a new gospel or mythos was said to have been promulgated by fishermen and water became the symbol of that age. In that sign we have been born and baptized and saved and Christ even represented himself as a "fountain of living water." But everything that the old sun stands for will now be thrown down. The new age will be one of air and light and electricity. The old age has been an age of horizontal warfare. The new age will be one of vertical warfare. Armageddon will now be fought out in the air. The old age has been one in which men have ruled. In the new age there will be a matriarchal form of government. The women are coming back into power. There is going to be a terrible trial of strength between Catholics and Protestants with a resulting destruction of them both. In fact, we are going to be destroyed in a night and only a few will be saved. But a new order of man is going to be evolved so far in advance of the man of today that we cannot even conceive what we will be like.

Is it not evident that a man in spiritual, emotional or intellectual distress who listens to information or

prophecy of this type will find not increased power to meet crises, but rather an increase in his own mental chaos? I am willing to admit that there are many religious services which might have the same effect. The point I wish to make is this: In every community there is a multiplicity of institutions to which a person can apply in times of stress, some of which help to lighten and some of which deepen chaos in one's life. Many men get drunk for the same reasons that other people are religious. It gives one a temporary release from strain but leaves one ultimately disturbed.

Many people — for the above case record is typical — increase the chaos in their lives by seeking contact with those who connect them with a chaotic universe. I would like to suggest an experiment for those impressed by this situation. You may call it a laboratory experiment in social psychology. You can try this on yourself and be your own judge of the results. I suggest that next Sunday afternoon you attend any one of the theaters in your city and expose yourself to the program. I shall not determine for you to which one you should go; probably, for my purpose, the worse the show the better. Then, after exposing yourself about an hour, I suggest you go to church and sit through, and enter into, the Sunday vesper service. Test the effect on your own faith and courage, the subordination of those qualities which relate you to the animal world and the exaltation of those which make you a person with the power to follow through on ideas and play your role in life. If I am not mistaken you will find

that the hour spent at the church, be it Protestant, Catholic or Jewish, will increase your ability to overcome those difficulties which must be overcome if you are to bear the responsibilities which an individual must take in the intimate relationships of life. This is not my personal judgment. Those who have been carrying on experiments in the study of the family can show by statistics that the chances for success in family life are very much increased by some association with the church and religion.

If one were to make a reasonable list of those virtues which work for personal and group success and those vices which work for personal and group failure, the scale would look something like the chart on the opposite page.

I suggest that we test our institutional experience on these two planes. If an institution increases ability to follow any project with constant good will, faith, humility and intellectual alertness, with their consequent personal and social results, it brings mental health. If on the other hand it encourages bluffing, shifting of responsibility, taking refuge in illusion, in the practice of cynicism, bitterness and hate with their consequent personal and social results, it is a source of mental disease; it deepens the chaos in our lives, and though temporarily it may have seemed a good experience, it has really routed us away from reality rather than into it. It has offered us poison and not health.

THE INTEGRATION OF PERSONAL AND GROUP ETHICS

<i>Honest facing of situation</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>				<i>Personal Results</i>				<i>Social Results</i>				<i>End Results</i>		
	1. Constant will for good	2. Faith	3. Humility	4. Intellectual alertness	1. Developing sense of self-worth	2. Integration of personal forces	3. Growing useful skill and habit	4. Fund of intel- lectual knowledge	1. Membership in group with high standards	2. Morale for improvement of standards	3. Growing group solidarity	4. Elimination of waste due to hate, rivalry, etc.	5. Increasing fund of skill and knowledge	1. Sense of univer- sality	2. Progressive in- tegration of self

THE DISINTEGRATION OF PERSONAL AND GROUP ETHICS

<i>Evasion and Compromise</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>						<i>Personal Results</i>						<i>Social Results</i>		<i>End Results</i>				
	1. Bluffing	2. Shifting responsibility	3. Refuge in delusion	4. Cynicism	5. Bitterness and hate	6. Suspicion	1. Lack of control	2. Emotional explosion	3. Withdrawal	4. Surrender	5. Loss of skill	6. Loss of intellectual ability	1. Mere gregariousness	2. Cult of self-defense	3. Organized effort to win at expense of others	4. Taking refuge in false reports and hearsay	5. Progressive disintegration	6. Progressive loss of skill and accurate knowledge	1. Progressive disintegration of group due to self-generated animosity

RELIGION AS A RESOURCE FOR MENTAL HEALTH

WE NOW RETURN to the questions with which we were concerned in the first chapter. We shall here explore the interplay between the family and religion. We must be prepared to see the family betrayed by religion even as it has been betrayed by society. But before we can understand that betrayal we must make clear to ourselves just what is the genius of religion. All through these pages we have been using religious words — values, devotion, will to live, the role of the individual, love and loyalty. These terms express the stuff out of which society is made, and they also are of the stuff of which religions are made. Religion is man in his believing and evaluating capacity. It is an answer to certain fundamental needs of man. Man, to be sure, is a physical being and demands food and clothing; but he is also a social being, and in this capacity he has certain characteristics which are peculiarly his own and through which his religious activities arise.

Four of these characteristics we should make very clear and definite to ourselves. First, man is a being

that hopes and fears. He is concerned about his fate in the universe. He does not know, and is worried about, what the morrow will bring. This was true of the ancient cave man and it is true of the modern science-enlightened man. In fact, I think it may be fairly said that modern scientific and technological development has increased, rather than allayed, man's fears. When I pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," I think of more obstacles to the fulfillment of that prayer than my grandfather knew anything about. He probably thought of sun and rain and soil and an abundant harvest. I think of all these, and in addition, railroads, labor unions, gangsters and profiteers and government policies; all man-made obstacles now added to the cosmic hazards which constituted the threat in the lives of my fathers. I know more diseases than they ever knew. We are able to control some of them under certain circumstances, but I know of so many more which might threaten my life that my sense of uneasiness has been increased rather than decreased in recent years. We can control cholera, bubonic plague and typhoid fever, provided the social organization holds, but who knows that it will? The British government has these three great threats to human existence fairly well under control in India; but who knows how long the British will have control of India? Never wholly laid are these great physical and cosmic threats to life which keep fear still alive in the human heart.

A friend of mine once said that religion comes in at

that point where what a man does depends not on what he knows, but on what he dares. This fact, he says, constitutes the reason for the need of ministers at weddings and at funerals, for both are ventures into the unknown. All of life is an adventure in the unknown, and the character of a man's adventure is more largely dependent on his courage than it is on his knowledge. Courage, then, is one characteristic human need.

A second great need is for recognition. Man cannot abide loneliness.

In the third place, man is a being who must find meaning in life. He abhors futility. When Colonel Goethals directed the construction of the Panama Canal, a part of his technique for building the morale of his men was to impress upon them the idea that they were doing this work for Uncle Sam. Who was Uncle Sam? Uncle Sam was an abstract character symbolic of millions of Americans who wanted this work done. They were not working for themselves, these men digging dirt on the Panama Canal. They were working for a larger than themselves.

Finally, man demands continuity. He abhors annihilation. The total obliteration of his own life and that in which he is involved, his friends and the causes he serves, is something he cannot face and so he demands continuity to exist longer than his own meager life. He hopes and believes that in a world of larger scope, that which he has faithfully worked for will be completed, not undone.

These major outreaches of the human spirit constitute the very essence of the human personality, and it is in the realm of these aspirations that we find religion coming to the front. Religion masses its ministrations at those points where human beings feel the emotional strain of life in one or more of these four ways which I have just suggested. If one studies the great religious festivals and services, one finds that they cluster around those places, those incidents and those occasions where men feel thwarted in their hope, or in their desire for recognition, or in their desire to find some meaning and continuity in life.

Religion is more than aspiration, but those major aspirations are the signposts which turn us in the direction of an understanding of religion. Let us not at this point make the mistake of identifying religion with these hopes and desires. No, religions are more than that. They never spring up just because men hope. They grow up around those facts which give men hope. No religion ever developed around fear alone, or around the desire for recognition or for meaning in life. Religions grow at that point where man has found some fact which he thinks gives him the right to hope or offers him recognition or meaning in the sense of continuity in life. Those men were wise who said that religion is built on revelation. By revelation they mean those evidences which give man the right to hope and not to fear, to feel comradeship and not to be lonesome, to work with causes with a sense of devotion rather than futility, and to believe in the ulti-

mate completeness of life. Of course there has been much of what has been called revelation that will not stand the tests which man has sought to impose upon it. Some freak of nature has often seemed a valid basis for hope, and man has built his life upon sand. But the religions which have continued are rooted in the soil of experiment with reality which has so validated man's experience with reality through love and faith as to justify his continuing exercise of these qualities.

The function of the church is the perpetual celebration of man's experience with reality through faith and love. The church gathers together those facts which constitute for man the great assurances of life. It perpetually recites them. It tells the story of those great personalities who convince us that men of character have justified our right to believe that we can make our lives sublime. The church is built not on man's longing, although it answers to a longing. The church gathers together those great assurances which provide answer to those four primary needs of the human spirit. If one analyzes the great festival days, the great calendars of the church, especially of the Roman Catholic church, one will find that the key which unlocks them is just this key which I have described. One finds the great festival occasions organized at those points where men stand in danger of falling victims either to loneliness or futility or to the threat of annihilation.

Much discussion of what the church should do for people ignores this need and ignores also the capacity of the church to meet it. The church has been asked

to give physical comfort, but somehow it never does this very well. The church has even been asked to make people moral, and again it disappoints its petitioners. The only valid demand, I think, is this: The church should keep people from being discouraged, isolated individuals who become frantic with fear or insane in the face of the great cosmic and social hazards of life. The function of the church seems to me the establishment of an inner community built on faith in the ultimate loving purpose of the universe, in which the individual becomes a member, in the eyes of which he wishes to be a success, and which, in turn, gives him a significant role to play in society.

I have said that the church masses its ministrations at the point of man's greatest emotional strains. A few years ago, while traveling in India, I noticed that at the corner of every village was an image of the rain god, the snake god, the cholera god, the moneylender god and the drought god. I was told that each of these images represented a major fear of the Indian farmer. These were his great worries, his great anxieties, his chief emotional strains. Religion had massed its ministrations at these points. That is what religion should do.

Religion is effective in working with the family only under certain conditions. Religious leaders must recognize — and many have — that man's major hopes and fears vary with his activities. He has one set of hopes and anxieties about his business, another about his politics, still another about his family. As there

are no feelings in life so deep as those which gather around family life, so the fears, hopes, anxieties arising from family problems are the most serious source of strain for the individual. It is at this point that the church is most needed and that it has attempted to mass its ministrations.

WHEN RELIGIONS BEHAVE BADLY

BEFORE I DEAL with what might be called good behavior on the part of religion with reference to the family, I want to enumerate the various kinds of behavior which may be classified as bad.

Religions behave badly when they try to set over the family a theocratic control which legalistically restricts its freedom. There is no area of life which religion has so invaded with the mailed fist of legalistic control as the family to which it is so intimately related. Legislation, good social practice and even the ministrations of mercy have been hindered by religious legalism. The Scotch physician who wished to introduce anesthesia in childbirth was told by the clergy that he was interfering with the original curse which God pronounced upon women when Eve was expelled from the Garden of Eden. Not until the canny Scotchman called attention to the biblical statement that when God took Eve from the body of Adam he caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, was he able to justify use of anesthetics. Something of the same stubborn formalism has characterized the fight of the church against any reasonable legislation affecting divorce and remar-

riage. As women have emerged into larger and larger participation in social life they have been compelled to fight against some very foolish remarks on the part of St. Paul as to the place of women in ecclesiastical society. In all these instances we have religion doing that which we refuse to recognize as good when it is done by the state or the race. Religion is trying to set up a totalitarian legalistic society.

Again, religion has behaved badly when it has looked upon sex life as sinful and has turned man in the direction of asceticism. We cannot get away from the fact that the New Testament story of the virgin birth of Jesus reflects a tendency in this direction, or at any rate provides ground for rationalization of this tendency.

Religions have behaved badly when they have thrown their weight on the side of chaotic personal behavior. In an earlier chapter I listed those vices which tend to personal and social disintegration. I refer to them again here to call attention to the fact that religion often encourages man's tendency to bluff, to evade reality, and to take the lower level in the struggle for life. Psychiatrists often look upon religion as a liability in social reconstruction because they believe it increases man's tendency to follow disintegrating vices.

Religions behave badly when they fail to discriminate in their emphasis on moral behavior. They often over-exalt small virtues and thus distort the moral life. The following case history will serve as a typical picture of much of the bad behavior into which people are often led by the church:

Jean was eighteen years old when she first came to the attention of medical and social agencies. Her little niceties of manner and certain manifest refinement at once singled her out from the group of women with whom she was confined in the County Jail. The jailer said, "she sure was a pretty little flapper and a wild one, too" but somehow she was "different" from the rest. She had been in jail six weeks and he hadn't heard her "cuss" yet.

According to Jean's own story, which was later verified, she had been reared in a home of wealth and comfort. Accustomed to attention from servants and governesses, she had never learned to do for herself the tasks which are required of the majority of girls. She did not know how to manage without these attentions and was seriously handicapped in her attempts to earn her livelihood.

There were eleven children in the family, six younger than herself, the twins among them, whom she "worshiped to distraction." Her parents were Scotch Presbyterians; her father the great High Priest and all wise judge for his family, from whose decisions there was no appeal. (It is hardly necessary to say that the family was distinctly a patriarchy.) As Jean said, she and her father "never could get along." She could not remember the time when she was not "wild to have a good time." She "loved to dance" and "adored the movies." Her "worldliness" had always been a trial to her father. She repeatedly declared that, as a child, she had been afraid of her father and now she despised him. Said she "guessed they were too much alike."

He couldn't "bear for anyone to cross him" and neither could she. Her mother was kind but she thought everything the father did was "just right." She thought her mother was afraid of him.

At the age of sixteen Jean ran away from home for the first time. With a classmate, with whom she had been forbidden to associate, she went to Kansas City. They were found at a hotel by a detective sent out from Mr. McWeldon's office. After Jean was brought home she was put under close surveillance, not allowed to leave the house alone. The "wayward" daughter was made the subject of prayer when the family and servants were called together for morning and evening worship. To gain her freedom, she finally professed "conviction of sin and repentance."

The next year when Jean was seventeen and in the ninth grade she answered an advertisement for a dancing teacher in an Eastland cabaret. Her application was accepted. Taking fifty dollars from her mother's purse, she kissed the sleeping twins good-by and went out into the night. Again after a few weeks Jean was found and brought home, but not before she had had a love affair with a man much older than herself to whom she became engaged.

When Jean escaped from home the third time she left with this man whom she had met at Eastland. She went as his wife only to find out shortly afterward that he was a married man with a family. After this nothing mattered. She was madly immoral and finally landed in the County Jail. On the docket she was

booked for prostitution and theft. She was listed under a fictitious name.

Facing each other across the flat-topped desk in Mr. McWeldon's private office, the Girls' Protective Agency worker and Mr. McWeldon discussed Jean. The father was obdurate. He said that he had brought Jean home twice. This time she must go her "own gait." He could not further compromise himself and his family by acknowledging her as his daughter. Jean must "reach her extremity" before anything could be done for her and emphasizing this statement by pounding with his fist upon the desk, he concluded, "She has the devil in her and not until she is converted and comes to me as the prodigal did to his father, will I forgive her." He refused any help.

Mrs. McWeldon said that Jean had always been a rebellious child but an affectionate one. She did well in school until she reached the sixth grade when school became a matter of secondary importance. So they placed her in a private school and gave her music and expression. She liked to dance and she seemed to enjoy the expression lessons but would not practice her music lesson. She would like to help Jean but she can't do very much against the wishes of Mr. McWeldon. She would like Jean to have the advantage of a mental and physical examination and special care if this seems necessary. If the worker will try to find some way for Jean to make good she will help as much as she dares financially. Mr. McWeldon checks all the accounts and this will be difficult.

“Dear Miss M. . . .

I must tell you I am so grateful to you for the assistance you have given and are giving to my Jean. I did try to give her up at one time but the Lord showed me plainly it was wrong to even try to do so and ever since my prayers daily and often I can't sleep for longing for her and M. . . . that I spend a great deal of the night asking God our Father to bring them to understand that the ways of Eternal Life far exceed those of sin in happiness now and hereafter. Now Miss M. . . . we want to help you. I will ask you to let us know what the amount of a room and board in a nice place will be by the week and I have some of her clothes here and I would like to bring them to her so I could see her. Now I thought with us paying her board she could be able to clothe herself and live respectably and give her a chance to be what she should be and then come home. Our desire is to have her now but three times were such failures that we want to try some other way. Now if you think that it would be best for me not to come will leave it with you or will come this week if she wants me or you think it would help for there is not much happiness for me until my two girls are settled Christians. Well Miss M. . . . I hope you will be able to understand my meaning for it's very hard for me to express it. May God make you to understand that my heart has been bleeding ever

since she left me so heartlessly and I never went to bed until three o'clock sitting watching and waiting for her the last time. Tell her I love her and want her to be a lady and want to do what I've written you and you may show her this letter if you like. Please answer me soon. Will be waiting you know for the answer.

Your friend in Jesus the Christ."

"Dear Miss M. . . .

Was sorry I hadn't time to see you again but I left a check for \$35 written to Miss McWeldon and Jean will have to do on this for one week for her expenses and get what clothing she can, also, and what do you think would be right to send each week as I would like to send it to you for her and you pay the room and board with it. I can't send all she wants and she must learn or we cannot help her. My suffering is nearly greater than I can stand; so will look for an early answer.

With Christian love,
Please give the letter addressed to myself to Jean and tell her to give me her address. These little bookmarks we print to distribute — would be glad to send you all you could use."

"I do not know what could be done further for you have been given this work to do and I know nothing about it, so be perfectly free to write us for

I want to do all in my power to help. Believe me your friend,

Mrs. L. L. McWeldon

P.S. We send you a \$5 check to help Jean on another week."

"Dear Miss M. . . .

Just received your letter and do certainly thank you for your help and care of our lost girl. She will have to repent and let God cleanse her from sin before she can come to our home again and I told her plainly that I would have nothing to do with her getting any doctor and she must go to you and I was sure you could direct her what to do. She told me over the 'phone she needed a doctor and I told her I could have nothing to do with it, and you see she will not listen or obey me. She did something with her last coat we bought her and I have none to send at present. I can breathe better this morning, yesterday I felt I would choke all day and such a pain in my heart. None but God knows what I have suffered with my family and am still suffering but Satan has not been able to stop me or us from serving the Lord. We are supporting a missionary in Central America, supporting an orphan, help support a cripple man and we are giving away tracts by the hundred and God says his word shall not return void and the great pleasure is giving Bible lessons and teaching a Sunday school class. Well, Miss M. . . . forgive me

for not giving you that other money for really I was so hurt and was not myself for I told her to go to you for your assistance. She could get by and she will have to thank God for sending you to help her for it's beyond me. M. . . . is trying to help her also, so she (M. . . .) writes me. Now if we are wrong in our dealings, please let us know."

The legalism, the substitution of religious benevolence for human love, revealed in the above picture, need no extended comment. Back of the bad behavior is a religion which sins the sin of a misplaced emphasis.

Religions behave badly when they fail to recognize the social nature and social conditioning of the family. Horace Bushnell said that the family was both the agent and the object of salvation. He hoped to see the time when individuals would grow up under the Christian nurture of the family and never realize that they had not been Christian. He places this picture over against that excessive emphasis on personal responsibility which fails to recognize the interrelationship between individual and family. Religions often blame people for being false to their religious vows, without taking into account the social conditions which preceded the taking of these vows and those which followed after the vows had been taken. When the church acquiesces in social exploitation which robs families of their opportunity to live the good life, it really

participates in the breaking of the vows by the families themselves; and when the church, possessing resources of mental health, does not make them available to the masses of the people, it is failing to do its part in making family life adequate.

XVII

WHEN RELIGIONS BEHAVE WELL

OUR LAST chapter concerned types of socially bad behavior on the part of religion. In this chapter we shall look at the other side of the shield.

Religions behave well when they offer to men fellowship in a society in which victory over hardness of heart, sensuality, pride and unbelief is an achievable goal. There is no social substitute for a kindhearted, courageous, wholesome-minded person. The husband or wife of good character is the greatest agency making for a happy home.

Religions behave well when they offer to people not theocratic legislation but a social imagination which makes it possible for those people to enter into the experiences of others and so identify themselves sympathetically with others. Jesus was one of the first to refer men to social imagination in discovering the good way of life. If you would know how to think of God, he said, imagine a good father. How would you treat your neighbor? Use your imagination to put yourself in his place and treat him in the way you would be treated. Sin is to be fought in its imagination stage. Adultery and murder are first of all sins of

the imagination; Jesus would fight them at this point. The Good Society concept began as a product of the creative imagination; it is the Holy City, the city not made with hands, the better country which men seek mentally as pilgrims. Religion which is brought to people in this spirit gives them a vocation, a role to play. They are stimulated to the highest type of co-operative self-investment.

Religions behave well when they bend the career of men and women toward an integrated personal and social life built around a life philosophy based on adequate religious convictions. In another chapter we outlined those virtues which lead consecutively in the direction of a personally and socially integrated life. While recognizing that religion can work for personal disintegration, we also must realize it is one of the most powerful forces working in the direction of personal and social integration. Those religions which give man a belief in the integrity of the universe, which teach him that there is a good order of life which is built into the very structure of the universe, throw the weight of their influence upon integrity of action and thus reinforce man in his personal and social struggle.

Religions behave well when they interweave the emotions which cluster around the ideas of the family of God and the City of God. The cultus of the church is rich with symbols and ritual which lift the family to the high plane of religious devotion. We should develop a cultus of the Holy City which will serve a similar purpose so that men will approach the tasks of

citizenship with some of the sense of dedication and consecration with which they now approach the marriage altar. When we do this the achievement will be based partly on the conviction that cities can be made into places in which it is not only possible but normal for little children to grow up in security and happiness.

Religions behave well, then, when they interweave the symbolism of the family with that drawn from religious experience, and when the cultus of religion reflects the experience drawn from the family. Let us enumerate those ritualistic services which the church performs inside the family and which have as their purpose the sanctifying of the family spirit:

THE MARRIAGE CEREMONY. The great opportunity of the church to exalt the home lies, of course, in this ritual. It should be regarded by the minister as a most solemn and sacred privilege. In every way in which he can co-operate, either by instruction, advice or inspiration, he should magnify his social opportunity at this time. Many a pastor has made use of special literature which has been of value to both bride and groom in helping them to assume the joys and responsibilities of home life.

FAMILY WORSHIP. Nothing binds a home together and guarantees its Christian quality quite as much as family worship. The church should encourage the family altar, both by urging it upon people and by suggesting proper methods of procedure.

GRACE AT MEALS. The family meal is lifted into the realm of the sacramental by many social courtesies

which gather about this occasion. Most important among ceremonies is the custom of returning thanks to the Heavenly Father for his goodness in making possible the fact of daily subsistence.

PARISH VISITING. In the parish visiting of the pastor and the friendly visitors of the church, official and non-official, there is a very important recognition of the home. The purpose of such visiting is not exhausted in a ministry to individuals. Its value lies in the seeking out and in the recognition of the home as a social group. The best parish visiting extends intimate pastoral care to the entire family, being indeed, in spiritual matters, very much like the work of the friendly visitor to a household.

In a similar fashion the cultus of the home is interwoven with the services performed inside the church. Among these can be enumerated the following:

THE FAMILY PEW. In the Protestant church the family pew represents a historic recognition which the church has given to the integrity of the home as a social unit. Although we are passing from the period when the church rents or sells its pews, there is a distinct value in the attendance of the family as a unit at the church service, and it can easily be arranged by a proper system of ushering, even when pews are free.

THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM. In the baptism of children, many of the Protestant churches see a consecration service which recognizes the child's relation to the Divine Father, and honors parenthood in its co-operative relationships with the church in the training of

the child. The value of this attitude is to be recognized and the service honored because of its social message.

CHILDREN'S SUNDAY. The church has here the opportunity to honor childhood in a special way and to magnify in the minds of the people the sacredness of childhood and that institution from which the children come.

FATHERS' AND SONS' BANQUET. This fete, which many churches have recently provided, gives splendid recognition to responsibility of the fathers for their sons and affords opportunity to increase the loyalty of the son to the father, and to the church as a second father.

MOTHER'S DAY. Churches are recognizing in this day a chance to exalt motherhood and to pay tribute to one who makes home life possible. The day has a distinct social message and should be used by the churches to emphasize it.

EDUCATION FOR HOME BUILDING IN THE CHURCH. The best preparation for home building which the church gives is the general policy of exalting those ideals and virtues which make successful home builders. But there is a special type of education which the church can give, in classes which prepare young men and women for the duties and responsibilities of home life. Many churches have successfully provided mothers' clubs in which the problem of home building is discussed by those who are engaged in its responsibilities. Similar discussions are often taken up by men's organizations in the church.

THE CHURCH AS SOCIAL CENTER FOR FUTURE HOME

BUILDERS. The social life of the church has made possible the meeting of innumerable young people where acquaintance has ripened into love, and love has been followed by marriage. This is a legitimate service to be planned for and encouraged in the church life. It guarantees the mating of people of similar religious ideals and ethical purposes.

Religions behave well when they offer to people a fellowship in the eyes of which these people want to be a success. Through this means, it is evident, a role or vocation is made for them in society. Once more, at the risk of overelaboration, I give a story from *Batter Cake Flats*. It is the story of "Theopa of the Covered Wagon."

Theopa had lived under a canvas wagon top all of her life. In the spring and fall when the family moved from place to place gathering strawberries or picking cotton, the covered wagon provided both a shelter and a means of transportation. In the summer, when the family camped in a grove on the outskirts of the city, the wagon top was removed and converted into a tent, while the wagon itself was used for collecting and hauling junk. In the winter this portable home was usually located near the city, in a certain community called Batter Cake Flats. If the cotton-picking season had been at all profitable the family went into winter quarters about the middle of November and stayed until March or April or at least

until the "cotton patch" money gave out and they were forced to go to work again. As Theopa's father used to say, "It warn't wuth it no ways to work in bad weather and the law was gettin' mighty perticular about folks schoolin' their kids in the winter."

The fall Theopa was twelve years old the family had had an unusually successful season in the cotton patch. Theopa herself had often picked three hundred pounds a day for which her father collected for the family treasury three dollars. For the first time in her life Theopa questioned the justice of this proceeding. She wanted some new clothes for school and above everything else she wanted a real doll like the ones she had seen in the stores Christmas after Christmas. Her father told her she was "plumb silly" while her mother said she had education enough. It was making her "stuck up." She could "jest stay at home" with them this winter and tell the school law when he would come around that she was fourteen and then the law couldn't force them to send her to school.

A few weeks later Theopa was caught in the act of stealing a doll from a display counter of a department store. She was turned over to juvenile authorities. The chief probation officer at the courthouse started an investigation. He found that this was not the first petty thieving of which Theopa had been guilty but he also found out that this was the first thing she had taken for herself.

Other articles had been taken at the command of her mother or father. The arrest of the father followed. Theopa was made a ward of the court. There was no objection to this latter on the part of the parents. The father, glad enough to pay his own fine and make his escape, remarked, "The law can do anything with Theopa it wants to. She sure has brought a peck of trouble on her family."

The matron was filling out Theopa's application blank, a duplicate of which was to go to the file in the juvenile office. "How old are you, Theopa?" "Twelve." "Where were you born?" "Travelin'." "Where?" repeated the matron. "Travelin'," answered Theopa. The girl appeared sullen. The matron thought best to pass on to the next question. "Where is your home now, Theopa?" "Ain't got none," replied Theopa. "Come, Theopa," said the matron encouragingly, "answer just this last question for me and I will take you to your room. I have one which I am sure you will like and you are going to find many things here which will make you happy. Where did you live before you came to us?" The officer, who had not yet taken his departure, spoke up. "She's just one of those cotton-picking children. She lives in a covered wagon." Before the words were hardly out of his mouth Theopa had snatched the ink bottle from the matron's desk and hurled it in the direction of the officer. There was a crash. "O, my Lor'," wailed Theopa, "I've smashed the look-

in' glass! Seven more years of bad luck." And she refused to be comforted all that day.

When Theopa received her first complete outfit of new clothes her forlorn little face became almost expressive, and a hair ribbon, which had not come from her father's junk heap, but which had been bought especially for her, brought the first smile. The matron showed her how to put her clothes away in the bureau in her room and how to hang the new gingham dresses each on its separate rack in the closet. But the next morning when the matron went to Theopa's room the clothes were nowhere to be seen. The closet was empty. The bureau drawers were empty. Not one article of the new wardrobe was to be found. The matron went downstairs decidedly perplexed. After lunch, during rest hour, she returned. Theopa, pushing back the mattress of her bed, showed the matron the missing clothes all carefully folded up and hidden away between the mattress and the springs. Only after several tests were made of leaving out just one dress or one garment in the bureau drawer was Theopa fully persuaded that the other children did not want her beautiful new clothes and that no one would take them from her if she kept them as the matron had instructed.

Care and training did much for Theopa. Her tantrums became less frequent and pilfering soon stopped when she found that in this new world, into which she had recently come, a person's pos-

sessions were sacred and swift punishment was meted out to any offender. The matron and the church lady, who came in her car to take the children to Sunday school, became her ideals and she set out to imitate them with all the force of will she possessed. One day, remembering perhaps the rough overseers in the cotton patch, the cuffs and beatings of her mother and the roughness of the other women with whom she had associated, she asked the Lady of the Car what made the matron different from other "bosses." Hardly knowing just how to answer the child she said, "Why, I don't know, Theopa, unless it's because she's a perfect lady."

The Lady of the Car and some other young women of the church, with their cars, made many trips to the cottage just before Christmas. No conception of Theopa's vivid imagination had ever even glimpsed the glories of that first Christmas carol; her first Christmas tree; her first doll. What more could be wished for?

In the spring a foster home was found for Theopa, where she was very happy and had many advantages. The Lady of the Car still treasures the first letter she received from Theopa after she had gone to her new home.

"My dear . . .

I like my new home very much but John teases me sometimes. The other day he made me mad

and I started to throw a teacup at him but I remembered and didn't. I am a perfect lady now.

Your friend,
Theopa."

Those who have read this little sketch may easily focus their attention on that which is to me nonessential. I recognize that nothing is done for Theopa's family—as a matter of fact she is taken out of the family. I recognize that nothing is done to right the wrongs of the cotton-pickers. Indeed, Theopa's problem is to an extent evaded when she ceases to be a cotton-picker. But all of this is not essential to my present interest. That which Theopa does get is a new picture of herself, a new role to play. She joins a group of people who establish for her a new vocation. She now has a picture of herself as a lady. This picture is drawn almost entirely from two religious workers in her environment. It is this new sense of a vocation in life which is much more important to her than her clothes or her physical surroundings, and it is this sense also which is the essence of that which the church has to give.

Religions behave well when they make available the resources for mental health which are inherent in the doctrines believed in and experienced by a sincere church group. The confessionals of the older churches, the mental health clinics of more recent date, the class meetings and prayer meetings of the less formal churches, can all be looked upon as devices whereby

the hopes and fears of people are shared and directed to some profitable outcome.

Religions behave well when they co-operate with other agencies in society which are especially designed to give aid to people. This is not the time to discuss how far the church should turn over to social agencies, public and private, its opportunity for ministering to the family. There probably is no hard and fast line to be drawn. To draw such a line immediately arouses such a host of objections to the policies it is meant to help that it seems best to leave the relationship co-operative and frank without legalistically determined boundaries.

Religions behave well when they hold up to society the basic values and needs of the family and demand that the test of a good social order be, not profits written in the ledger, but the human test of the effects of a social order upon a wholesome, vigorous family life.

XVIII

WHOM HATH GOD JOINED?

THROUGHOUT this study we have been facing the question of authority and purpose in the family. It is essentially the question: For whom does the family exist? In our study of Oriental families it was clear that the family existed for the sake of the race. In the conventional marriage the family existed for the sake of the class. In the democratic or romantic marriage, the family seemed to be founded on the romance and the satisfaction of the desires of the man and woman who entered into the relationship. In the totalitarian state marriage, in a very real sense, exists for the state. In the Christian system, however, marriage exists for God.

"Whom God hath joined together," then, would take on a meaning for us if we compared it with some other possible statements. We might for instance formulate these:

"Whom parental authority has joined together . . ."

"Whom class has joined together . . ."

"Whom we ourselves have joined together . . ."

"Whom the state has joined together . . ."

We must recognize then that our formula "Whom

God hath joined together ” calls for a definition of God and the kind of society which he would sanction. The term evidently is kindred to the phrase, “the City of God ” or “the Kingdom of God.” In the history of Western religion these terms have been progressively defined. There was a time when God was identified with the race. At that time “whom the race has joined together ” and “whom God hath joined together ” would have been synonymous. There was a time when God was identified with the state. At that time “whom God hath joined together ” and “whom the state hath joined together ” would have been identical statements. There was a time when God and custom were synonymous. At that time “whom God hath joined together ” and “whom the sacred law hath joined together ” would have been interchangeable.

But in the New Testament and under the inspiration of Jesus of Nazareth the Society of God took on more profound meaning. It was stripped of race, of national and of legal definition, and those who were members of this new society were given a vocation to follow with persons who entered into fellowship with Jesus Christ. Those who entered into this fellowship were thrown back upon the use of their imagination in discovering, defining and defending that which was holy. They became the Society of the Holy Imagination. The New Testament is essentially a record of those who have accepted the Christian vocation.

This vocation is defined, as are all vocations, by the story of typical persons, by little ethical codes and phi-

losophies of life, windows through which we can look at the inner life and purpose of a whole community. There was something universal about this community. It rose above all class and caste and racial boundaries. It was not static. It was dynamic and creative. It was a society based on faith, expressing itself in love. No longer was the Society of God identical with the state or race or class or custom. To be sure the phrases, "the City of God" and "the Kingdom of God," were still used but they meant that the City and the Kingdom were taking on more of the characteristics of the Society of God as defined in records of this early holy community. The phrase, then, "whom God hath joined together," indicates that there is spiritual kinship between this interpretation of the Society of God and the family over which this sacred formula has been used. The family then becomes one of the ways in which the Christian vocation finds local and present interpretation. Such interpretation cannot be worked out unless there is freedom, mutuality of purpose and regard for other values of life.

The statement, then, "whom God hath joined together," as over against a union rooting in the will of the race or the will of the class or the self-will of individuals or the will of the state, is essentially a principle of freedom. It gives the family the right to rise above society in its customary aspects. On the other hand, it is a principle of social obligation as opposed to individual self-pleasing. It calls upon the individual to be reverent before all the obligations for carrying through

the genius of the family and before the other values which reside in other functions of society. It stands for the subordination of both the part and the whole of society to an ethical world which has the right to criticize both.

The phrase "whom God hath joined together" is not, then, the statement of a historical fact. God is not here conceived as a divine matchmaker who has brought these two people together from the ends of the earth. Rather it belongs to the language of reverence and dedication in the face of moral responsibilities. It signifies a mutual commitment to ideals which have been accepted by those entering into the relationship. It is the language of allegiance to a recognized spiritual economy. It should not be used where these conditions are not recognized.

What is the function of a minister in a marriage ceremony? If the most important problem about marriage is the physical problem, call in the doctor. If the most important problem is economic, call in the economist. If the most important problems are housing and general social arrangements, call in the social engineer. If, however, the most important problems have to do with authority and purpose in family life and the relationship of the family to a social and cosmic order, the minister has a real function, for he stands for that spiritual order which will defend the family against the state or the class or the race when these try to set themselves up as absolutes. He will defend the family against the passions which originate in the animal

world and which may finally disrupt the intimate relationships of man and woman and parent and child. If the business of the church is to discover, define and defend that which is holy, the minister brings into the marriage ceremony that principle of reverence and dedication which makes the family free in the midst of those tyrannies which come up from the animal world and are ever present in the social world.

XIX

SUMMARY

MOST OF OUR discussions have centered around the democratic family, a peculiar product of the West, the result of the emphasis of individual rights and freedom. The democratic family at present shares in most of the strengths and weaknesses of the democratic philosophy of life. About the future of the family there can be no doubt; family life is older than any national life we know. It is older than the churches; it seems as old as human history. There have been different kinds of family life, to be sure, but wherever mankind has existed there has been some kind of society organized around the control and direction of sex life. Family life has to a large extent shared in the type of culture and the general social organization of which it has been a part. As our own type of family life came with the democratic movement, it will share the fate of this movement in the future and whatever modifications take place in the movement will probably be registered also in the family.

The democratic family, as I have said, stands over against two other types of family — the larger patriarchal family of the Orient and the marriage of conven-

tion in Europe. In these types of family experience very little emphasis is laid upon the wishes and decisions of the bride and groom. The rights of society and the race are considered to such an extent that complete subordination of the desires of the individuals most concerned is taken for granted. But this does not mean that these marriages are totally without romance. There are resources of romance in the conventional marriage and in the marriage of the Orient. The sense of devotion to a cause and sacrifice in itself lifts one up to a more significant plane of living than does the mere satisfaction of individual desires. We have called attention to the fact that millions of the world carry on under what might be called a nonromantic marriage system. Surely no one can be foolish enough to believe that these families are all without joy.

The families of the democratic world are different. There is, first of all, freedom of courtship which starts early between Western boys and girls, and this acquaintance and courtship ripens early into a highly competitive state of love-making, with emphasis upon the freedom of those participating. If this courtship ripens into marriage the bride and groom accept for themselves generally the task of self-support, something unknown in Oriental countries. They live by themselves in a single house or apartment, and they must be sufficient for each other's company; this, too, is unknown in an Oriental country. It is assumed that they go through life in a relationship of fidelity. They freely associate with other people and bring their chil-

dren into a world of fairly free relationships. Thus the democratic marriage differs from Old World customs.

But in spite of this individualistic emphasis there are those who say that democracy has not yet been sufficiently realized, that marriage is still keyed to a man-made world, that woman does not yet have a free field for the expression of her personality, and that fear and tradition still hold the family in bondage. These critics would make the marriage relationship even freer than it is today. And it is possible that a larger freedom and intelligence might bring more romance into the marriage relationship.

There are others, however, who would improve the democratic marriage in another direction. They point to the fact that the rest of society — business, politics and religion — is already discovering the limitations of individualism as a philosophy of life, and that we are emerging from a period when the emphasis has been upon individualism into one where the emphasis will be upon the rights of society as a whole. They point to the fact that the great tasks of life are those in which people enter into agreements with one another and do things together which they cannot do alone, and that the law of all these realms is not the law of an accentuated individualism but of loyalty, sacrifice and subordination of self to the larger self.

The great difficulty with a romantic marriage is that those who enter into it may forget that man as an individual is under obligation to establish societies if he is to complete himself. Its critics point out that those

who enter into the marriage experience must seek a further, larger experience, not through intensification of passion or the physical allurements of sex life, but in a larger recognition of those ways for social living which must be taken into account by those who form societies. The improvement of family life lies not so much in the hands of the doctor or the psychoanalyst as in the hands of those who lead the masses of the people and teach them the laws of social living. In other words, marriage needs not more individualism but a better social philosophy. When asked for a bill of particulars, these critics point to the laws of social living of which we must take account if a group of people are to enter into association with one another. There must, they say, be an integrity and sincerity of purpose on the part of those who enter into these social relationships. There must be mutual sharing and answering trust. There must be a relationship of the family with the other great causes and the other great enthusiasms of society.

Family life gets part of its romance out of the fact that it is a part of a great social will to live. That will is made up not only of family instincts and family satisfactions, but of the many other satisfactions which combine to make a great people. And if the family is going to have an abundance of romance, it must be a romance that it shares with the other great enthusiasms of society. People who enter into the intimate relationships of family life must understand that they establish roles for one another, that the roles of husband, brother,

wife and sister root in an interacting relationship of persons who are joined together in the unit called the family. This interacting relationship can work in one of two ways: it can exalt people to a high plane of social living, or it can bring them down to the lowest stages of personal and social disintegration. Therefore, these people who enter into this relationship become, to a greater or less extent, not individuals, but members of a society. It is failure to recognize this fact, these critics say, and not the limitations of the individuals, which constitutes the real difficulty with the family at the present time.

There are modifications in the democratic family experience which, doubtless, can be turned to advantage. For instance, it might be possible to take advantage of the freedom of courtship and voluntary engagement to urge people to enter into the family relationships with more thoughtfulness, with more of an understanding of one another's likes and dislikes, with more purpose. Again, we might recognize that when two individuals pledge their fidelity to each other and go to live by themselves, their resources for fellowship are limited. That suggests the need for bringing in accessories of fellowship to keep the family from becoming isolated. Dr. Gerald Birney Smith, a former teacher of ethics at the University of Chicago, made the very wise statement that a church social was a place where two people who had been living something of an isolated life in a city apartment could associate with other men's wives and other wives' husbands on a basis of

legitimate fellowship and thus increase the fellowship resources of a Western marriage. The principle is of great importance. Two individuals are in difficulty if they have no fellowship resources outside their own. Accordingly, there should be recognized, as a necessary accessory of the democratic marriage, a fairly large freedom in orderly relationships, in the course of which men and women may get that degree of fellowship which, in the Orient, a couple get when they join one of the larger families.

Passing from this basic modification of the individualistic principle, those who would modify the democratic marriage call attention to the fact that family life at present is undergoing a great crisis, partly because of the shift in modern society from a homespun to a machine age. Most of those duties which once made the family so important are now ceasing to be important; the family rests on a simple relationship and it must rely on common purpose to hold it together. It would be a major task to enumerate those various services bought in the market which once were performed by the housewife. We have called attention to the fact that probably one reason husbands have to give such close attention to business is that now they must earn the money to buy a very large number of services which once the wife provided inside the home. We come, then, to the question of how we may build an integrated modern family and help it meet its crises.

Our problem here is to bring the family into relationships with other agencies, some of them very mod-

ern, and with those resources for mental health which make it possible for people to go through the crises of life with some measure of success. This is the task of the church, the school, the social workers, and those specialized agencies which are equipped to deal with the family. We must recognize that the great areas of family disorganization are not those in which people have opportunity to make some great choice in the direction of freedom; the great areas of family disorganization are those in which everything else is disorganized. In other words, family disorganization is a phase of a general social disorganization. And if we are really going to deal with it at all successfully, we will have to deal with the total disorganization.

At present the redistribution of a large number of these families into a better, less disorganized economic life would probably do much to stabilize them.

There are two further suggestions of ways in which we might help the family. We might work for a new conviction of the importance of family life, and for the development of social codes which will make people believe that the building of families and the rearing of children is necessary and worth sacrifice. The second is that to which I have already referred — the security of a social order in an economic system which does not penalize parenthood, but makes it more possible. In other words, family life must be written into the fabric of the nation as one of the great group values for which the nation will contend and which it will constitute as the objective of national well-being.

The future of the democratic family seems assured. No other institution in society shows any large tendency to take over the family function. There are those who think that the state will take over the family function. The more I see of states and the more I see of American political organization, the more I am satisfied it would be better for the ethics of the family to be extended into the state rather than that the state should extend its type of life into the family. I believe that the increasing control of family by state is a peril which should be fought in a democratic country.

Again, a democratic family is important because it is about the only effective way of thwarting some kind of caste system. So long as young people have the right to fall in love outside the bonds of caste or convention, no caste system can effectively impose itself on a nation. An unfettered Cupid can do more to break down caste systems than any other force. The democratic family points to a classless society.

And, finally, the democratic family which is based on affection will keep alive in society those values which are basic to a worth-while culture. The difference between Denmark and Germany is essentially this difference: the center of Denmark's regeneration was a love story. A young man by the name of Grundtvig, disappointed in love, nevertheless came to the conclusion that the love of God was his most perfect possession and that it was essentially the rule of the universe. He came to be the leader of his nation and drew his philosophy for a new national life from the

idea that roots in the family. It was the extension of this philosophy and the social organization of the family to touch the furthest outreach of national life that gave us present-day Denmark with its splendid social organization. Germany, on the other hand, in a later but similar crisis, drew her idea from the state and from the race and sought to impose them on the family. Because of her emphasis upon the state and the race she finds difficulty in showing respect to families of another race. Only those families have standing in Germany which are members of the race. The Jewish family happens to be the outstanding object of her hostility at the present time, but the philosophy calls for a disregard of all families which are not members of the Teutonic race. This attitude looks in the direction of a caste system; injury to the family and all the more intimate phases of culture seems an inevitable consequence.

In this country our democratic life, our democratic philosophy, should cause us to see every family as worthy of respect. The family must not be compelled to be members of a certain race in order to be respected. Thus we ought to have a perpetual drive against an otherwise inevitable caste system.

So the democratic family has its very real contribution to make to a national culture. It keeps alive in society those values of affection and democratic regard for the individual which are deeply rooted in our culture and which need to be preserved for the future. There will, of course, be modifications in the attitude

of the state and race toward the family, but essentially the maintenance of this family based on affection seems necessary to a good society. The law of the state is force; the law of business is trade and profits; the law of the family is affection and compassion. The rewards of society in the family are placed not at the feet of the strong, but at the feet of those who need them most. Society would forget this were it not perpetually having the family experience.

The family, it seems to me, has not only a contribution to make to general and social culture, it also has its contribution to make to religion. When we use the words, "Our Father who art in Heaven," we indicate that the basic principle of social organization is a family principle—one of generosity, of regard for the weakest, of tenderness. These words would become formal were we not continuously having the experience of fatherhood, brotherhood, and the like, within family relationships. The family, therefore, to a certain extent carries on in its intimate relationships that which is the heart and core of religion.

On the other hand, religion also has its contribution to make to the family. Down through the years our religion has been sympathetic with the family. Its great services which organize around family experience reflect the fact that religion looks upon family experience as vital to itself. It teaches men patience, it teaches them the obligation to love. It believes that the family philosophy of the future, aid and tenderness, is after all the basic philosophy of the universe. And there is

a perpetual interaction between the great idea of reliance and the great idea of family. If they can join together in a mutual relationship of support and look out upon the rest of society as areas in which these ideas need to be projected, we will have a force making for the regeneration of all society.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 005 973 6

